The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXXIII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JULY 17, 1935 NUMBER 1076

Contents

The Week 261

Editorials

Ethiopia: Lesson in War 264
Self-Help for the Unemployed 266

General Articles

Britain Veers Toward Germany ... H. N. Brailsford 267
The Soviets Take Stock ..... Clyde O. Hunter 269
The Good Giant and the A.A.A. ..... Alexander Farmer 272
What the Working Class Reads ... Robert Cantwell 274
Forest Hour (verse) ..... James Daly 276
Washington Notes ..... T. R. B. 277
Other People's Money ..... John T. Flynn 278
On the Labor Front ..... W. P. Mangold 279
A Note on Abstract Painting ..... James Johnson Sweeney 280

Correspondence 281

Books in Review

Mr. Justice Cardozo: A Man of Good Will ..... Max Lerner 283
Blessed Are the Peacemakers ..... Hans Kohn 284
Under the Round Table ..... Jerre Mangione 285
Grandaddy of the G-Men ..... Herman Simpson 286
On the Bum ..... Otis Ferguson 286
Books in Brief 287

The Week

THE President took a thorough beating from the House of Representatives when by a large majority it rejected his earnest plea to pass the bill abolishing public-utility holding companies. His only hope in the matter is now that the Senate will favor this clause—though if it does so, the margin can hardly be more than two or three votes—and that while the difference is being adjusted in conference an investigation of utility lobbying will bring to time the recalcitrant Democrats in the House. The whole affair is a demonstration, to those who favor a new party, of the unreliability of the Democrats even in relatively minor issues when large private interests are at stake. Meanwhile the new $4,000,000,000 spending program is delayed, as informed persons expected it would be, having put only a few hundreds at work. The government has also, according to the expectation of critics of the program, failed to pass the "unemployables" back to the tender mercies of the states. It is announced that in the fiscal year just ended the government did not succeed in spending what the budget estimated, not within $1,200,000,000. And tax receipts were slightly higher than expected. Secretary Morgenthau explained to a congressional committee how various new tax schedules, drawn up in response to the President's appeal for greater taxation of wealth, would increase revenues. The Wagner labor-disputes bill was signed, though it will not be obeyed by anti-union employers, and Mr. Roosevelt urged Congress to pass the Guffey coal bill, though the Supreme Court is expected to declare it unconstitutional. He wants to make it a further demonstration of just how far the present constitutional system hampers the government.

POTENTIALLY the most important domestic event of the week was the meeting in Chicago of numerous prominent individuals and representatives of groups who desire to create a new political party devoted to production for use instead of for profit. A number of the advanced Congressmen attended—though Marcantonio of New York withdrew—and Senator Nye addressed the meeting. A temporary organization was effected to prepare for the building of a party machinery in the states and the calling of a national convention. Congressman Amlie of Wisconsin was elected chairman, Alfred M. Bingham of New York executive secretary, and Professor Paul Douglas of Chicago treasurer. The American Commonwealth Political Federation was the name adopted. A resolution to exclude Communists was tabled, though the chairman of the meeting announced that this did not mean that Communists would be admitted. The platform tentatively adopted includes public ownership and operation of natural resources, transportation and communication, public utilities, mines, munitions plants and basic industries, as well as of the banking system. It proposes a constitutional amendment giving Congress power to make all laws necessary to provide for the welfare of the people. It favors government regulation of the marketing of farm commodities to give the farmers a price equivalent to cost of production. It advocated production for use by the unemployed, economic-security measures, taxation of wealth, genuine collective bargaining,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

civil rights, the soldiers' bonus and international peace.

NEWS from abroad is largely concerned with Ethiopia and Italy, a subject which is discussed elsewhere in this issue in a separate editorial. In Asia, however, gleamed another flicker of the creeping fire of war. Soviet Russia protested to Japan against border violations in the Amur River; at the same time the Soviet press declared that Germany and Japan had concluded a secret agreement for joint action against Russia, should either party go to war with her. Nothing, of course, is more likely. Japan replied to the protest with a proposal for a tripartite commission to settle border disputes between Siberia and Manchuria. The Soviet government, not wanting to incur the danger of war, accepted the offer. Immediately thereafter Japan continued her policy of aggression by joining with Manchukuo in an ultimatum to Mongolia, which is closely associated with Russia, demanding the right to establish a corps of observers in that region. The European pot was stirred again by the approval of a bill in Austria preparing the way for a return of the Hapsburgs, an eventuality bitterly opposed by the Little Entente.

THE reply of Secretary of State Hull to Emperor Haile Selassie was widely misinterpreted by the press. It was taken to mean that the United States would not interest itself in the Italian-Ethiopian dispute, and would not invoke the Kellogg-Briand Pact. This is the exact opposite of what Mr. Hull intended to convey. Despite its oblique diplomatic language, the note was a direct slap at Mussolini and Italy's imperialist ambitions. According to trustworthy sources, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hull are greatly concerned about the impending conflict, and are reported to be in secret consultation with the British government over possible means of stopping it. The interest of the United States is not altogether altruisitic. The only recent concession of importance granted by Haile Selassie, that for damming Lake Tsana, is held by an American engineering company, and is looked upon with great solicitude by our State Department. The Department also shares the general opinion that Mussolini is preparing to take a bigger bite than he can comfortably chew. They believe that the conquest of Ethiopia would tie up Italy's military force for an indefinite period, with disastrous repercussions upon European politics, and in consequence upon the world economic situation. However, there seems to be little that the United States can do. The Kellogg-Briand Pact cannot legally be invoked until a definite act of war has been committed, and then it will amount to nothing more than a toothless snarl. For the present, the United States will probably content itself with giving support to the fumbling peace efforts of England, whose motives, it may be added, are even more obviously self-seeking than ours.

FIFTEEN Americans, forming a Commission of Inquiry into political and economic conditions in Cuba, were arrested immediately upon arrival at Havana, imprisoned for a day and a night in a government fortress, and then deported back to the United States on the same ship that brought them. This was the answer of the Mendieta-Batista dictatorship to an attempt to evaluate the position of the Cuban people under the present regime. The American Ambassador and consular officials took no official notice whatever of the incident, thus continuing Ambassador Caffrey's policy of friendship for, and occasional active connivance with, a government regarded by many observers as more brutally tyrannical than even that of Machado. Clifford Odets, brilliant young playwright of the Group Theatre, headed the Commission of Inquiry, and each member of the party was the representative of a national organization. Their sole purpose was to observe and report. The manner of their reception will leave with Americans an even worse impression about Cuban conditions than the unfavorable report that the delegation would undoubtedly have made if it had been permitted to investigate.

THE Army Air Corps jubilantly announces the completion of a giant, four-motored bomber capable of carrying six tons of bombs and of cruising six thousand miles without refueling. No Japanese can read this announcement, we imagine, without instinctively recalling the new landing fields that the Air Corps is developing in Alaska. The new bomber has special equipment enabling it to fly at thirty thousand feet, higher than any fighting plane that Japan is known to possess can climb. From Alaska, it could fly to the main Japanese islands, discharge its six tons of bombs, and then, mounting to the substratosphere, return to its base without fear of counter-attack. The War Department also announces that this summer, for the first time in the country's history, maneuvers will be held on a war scale, with as many as thirty-six thousand men under one command. It is hard to see why the charge of militarism leveled against the Kaiser's Germany could not be equally well maintained against Mr. Roosevelt's America. Pre-war Germany unceasingly piled up new and terrible armaments until it frightened the whole world. Though the United States is in far less peril from its neighbors than was Germany, we have embarked upon the same course.

ACTING N.R.A. Administrator O'Neill was asked last week whether the voluntary codes submitted by industry would be turned over to him for the "spade work" of investigation. He replied cryptically: "Spades can be used for many things, including the digging of graves." The grave that Mr. O'Neill had in mind, it is clear, was that of the N.R.A. It will contain not merely the fleshless bones of the Blue Eagle, but a major part of Mr.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Roosevelt's labor program. After the Schechter decision, the announcement was made that voluntary codes must contain wages-and-hours provisions acceptable to the N.R.A. Now it appears that the codes, of which more than sixty are in readiness, will go directly to the Federal Trade Commission, and that wages-and-hours provisions may be omitted. In addition, the Federal Trade Commission is reported to be prepared to take a more lenient attitude than in the past towards open-price agreements and other forms of price-fixing. If these reports are true, industry will regain all the privileges it lost, while labor will get nothing. Since the trade-association executives sponsoring the voluntary codes are determined and experienced lobbyists, there is great danger that the most indefensible features and practices of the old N.R.A. will be stealthily revived.

MAYOR T. Semmes Walmsley of New Orleans, because of his opposition to Huey Long, has been given more attention than he rightfully deserves. A strike of New Orleans garbage collectors, called because of the city's failure to pay their wages, has brought the Walmsley-Long feud to the newspapers again. The mayor charges that Long has deliberately crippled the city's finances in order to force his resignation. Long replies: "I'll make things so hot for him that he'll fry in his own grease and be glad to get out." Meanwhile, despite promises of the F.E.R.A. to meet the necessary New Orleans payrolls, the collectors go unpaid and the garbage remains uncollected. Mayor Walmsley's days are politically numbered. Huey is out to get him and, in the end, Huey will. It is only a question of a few months before Huey calls his rubber-stamp legislature together and ousts Walmsley from office. This, when it happens, can hardly be called a calamity. Mr. Walmsley, the nominee and titular head of the Old Regular ring, is nothing more than a common variey of American politician and it is conceivable that his removal might be advantageous to New Orleans—were it not for the fact that his successor will be equally incompetent and, in addition, a tool of Huey Long. The whole country might well echo the sentiments of one of our New Orleans correspondents: "When the garbage collectors get back to work again, it would be a big relief to everybody if they picked up both Walmsley and Long."

IF THE chief objective of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration was to raise the price of food, it can look back on the past two years with considerable satisfaction. From the low point of the depression to the high of this spring, at the end of April, retail food prices advanced by nearly 40 percent, according to the index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Not surprisingly, the effect of this boost has been, in some instances, to reduce consumption very sharply and to turn consumers to cheaper substitutes. Some illustrations of this are presented in the July bulletin of the National City Bank:

> The consumption of butter, which climbed to 38 cents wholesale in New York City last February, has dropped 15 percent below a year ago, while consumption of oleomargarine has nearly doubled.
>
> Beef prices at retail are more than 35 percent above last year, and pork and lard over 50 percent higher, due to reductions in the supply of 17 percent in beef, 38 percent in hog products and 27 percent in all meat products. The drop in consumption has been almost as great. . . .
>
> Cotton-seed oil is another product whose apparent consumption during the past few months has run below a year ago, following a price advance of 110 percent; and egg consumption has likewise dropped.

Can either the farmers or the workers tolerate rises in the price of food if incomes of consumers do not increase enough so that the food can be purchased? What is the administration going to do about that?

THE United States Senate included in its unanimous-consent calendar for June 24 a virtually unnoticed item that now stands revealed as one of the most pernicious measures ever passed by that body. This is the so-called "incitement to disaffection" bill, which was introduced by Senator Tydings of Maryland, referred to the Naval Affairs Committee, reported out and adopted without even the formality of a public hearing. The bill provides "That whoever advises, counsels, urges or solicits any member of the military or naval forces of the United States, including the reserves thereof, to disobey the laws and regulations governing such military or naval forces, or whoever publishes or distributes any book . . ." having the same objectives shall be punished by a fine of as much as $1,000 or two years' imprisonment, or both. Such a measure would have the effect of outlawing practically any spoken or written protest against war, on the ground that such a protest might eventually reach a member of the military establishment and weaken his resolution in the performance of his duty. A second section of the bill provides for search and seizure of suspected writings, and if this drastic invasion of civil liberties is enacted into law, it will mark the first time America has had a peacetime sedition act since 1798. The bill carries a particular menace for labor because it would forbid any protest against the use of troops in strikes, and, indeed, a striker who might appeal to a National Guardsman to desist from shooting or gassing him would automatically be liable to imprisonment. The American Civil Liberties Union, The American League Against War and Fascism and other organizations are carrying on an active campaign against the measure. It is to be hoped that the House of Representatives, where the bill now lies in the hands of the Military Affairs Committee, will effectively dispose of it for all time.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ONE way to penalize a worker's efforts to make a living for himself is to invoke a criminal-syndicalism law. This recently has been done with particular severity and injustice in the case of Kyle Pugh, who was sentenced in Jackson County, Oregon, for selling "subversive" literature. His story is an interesting one. He was born in Marion, Virginia, forty-eight years ago and as a child was taken by his parents to Blackfoot, Idaho. He was permitted to remain in school until he reached the ninth grade. He helped out on the family cattle ranch in summer and worked in the mines near Butte in winter. In time the family lost the ranch, and Kyle worked variously as a miner, a prospector and a sawmill hand. He managed to save a little money, and a few years ago set himself up in business as a breeder of donkeys. The venture failed, and he turned them out to graze. With so many prospectors needing pack mules, most of the animals soon disappeared. The remainder he sold for salami. He just kept one donkey for himself, and, in a home-made cart, set out to investigate rumors of a gold strike on the Rogue River in Oregon. The rumor proved false. At the end of his resources, Pugh applied for relief. This was denied because he was not only unmarried but, retaining his one donkey, he was still a man of property. In May, 1934, on behalf of the United Farmers' League, he began selling literature to the impoverished farmers of Jackson and Josephine Counties. The pamphlets told of what other countries, especially Russia, were doing for farmers, and described what a collectivized economy might accomplish for workers and farmers the world over. For one brief summer he supported himself by selling pamphlets, and then he was arrested. In the United States of America, this man, so thoroughly American in his background and the variety and tenacity of his individual enterprise, was rewarded with a sentence of five years in the penitentiary.

THE facts in the case of Walter Baer, thirty-seven-year-old civil engineer of Portland, Oregon, who stands in the shadow of deportation to a hostile Nazi Germany, seem to warrant intervention by the Secretary of Labor. Baer incurred the displeasure of Portland authorities by his efforts on behalf of relief workers, and an order for his deportation was obtained on the ground that he had served a short prison term for forgery in 1923. Although he later married the daughter of an Oregon pioneer, has three children and, according to The Oregon Journal, "in the interim has lived an exemplary life, has acquired an honorable profession . . . and served with distinction in the United States geodetic survey for the city of Portland," efforts to have the deportation order rescinded have proved unavailing. Neither Baer nor his wife and children can even speak the language of Germany, and in recent times we have had all-too-vivid testimony as to what happens to men of Baer's political views at the hands of Hitler's Brown Shirts. To send Baer to Germany under these conditions imposes a sentence far more drastic than any contemplated in a mere order of deportation. It is a sentence that we hope the Secretary of Labor will have the common humanity to avoid.

SIR Josiah Stamp, the noted English economist, who recently visited the United States, told his countrymen on his return that "there is a general tendency to industrial revival. Everywhere I went I saw the appearances of well-being." This was no doubt meant as a friendly little statement, but if it is to be taken seriously, one wonders where in the world Sir Josiah went. To some of the better clubs, hotels and country homes, no doubt. We should not expect him to consort intimately with the share-croppers, coal miners, textile operatives, or with any of the 20,000,000 people on relief or the more than 10,000,000 unemployed. But, as an economist, he would be expected to go to some repository of the statistics covering these matters, or at least to see an index of industrial production, which has been declining ever since February.

Ethiopia: Lesson in War

THIS IS a bad season for those who still believe that international agreements, among nations constituted as at present, can prevent war. Let us look for a moment at the Italian-Ethiopian situation as an example.

Italy and Ethiopia are both members in good standing of the League of Nations. As such they have made a solemn covenant to settle their disputes peaceably and to join in sanctions against any nation that declines to submit to such peaceable adjustment. Disputes have recently arisen between them—relatively minor disputes concerning border raids and the execution of commercial concessions. Conciliation of these disputes is now progressing through the regular League machinery. Yet nobody doubts that Italy intends to make war on Ethiopia and, if she can, establish a protectorate over it by force, no matter what happens around the council table. Il Duce is waiting only for September and the end of the rainy season, to begin his campaign. He repeatedly announces to the Italian people that conquest is his intention. More than 100,000 men have left Italy for the scene of action; by September 225,000 will be there, equipped with the most modern war machinery and devices, including an acid to spread on the ground and burn the unshod feet of their enemies.

Great Britain, having interests in Ethiopia that she wants to protect—the sources of the Nile, which waters Sudanese cotton, are there—has been eager to settle the dispute short of the Italian demands. British statesmen did not rely on the League machinery and the processes of justice. That would be too simple-minded. Instead they offered a bargain. Ethiopia, they suggested, would grant con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cessions to Italy for cotton and coffee plantations and for a railway across her territory linking the separated Italian colonies in East Africa. In return, they would cede to Ethiopia a strip of British Somaliland to give her access to Zeila, on the Gulf of Aden. Mussolini haughtily rejected this bargain, thus giving further proof of his intent to fight and conquer. And, when the news came out in London, indignant M.P.'s asked by what right the diplomats offered to give away British territory to anybody.

The question then arose: what would Great Britain do when Italy violated her solemn covenant? Mussolini had threatened to withdraw from the League if it tried to thwart him, just as Japan did after her rape of Manchuria. But that would not absolve the League members of their obligation to apply sanctions. Public sentiment in favor of the League and its means of compelling peace had just been overwhelmingly demonstrated by a popular ballot in England. The League could stop this war easily—as it could not stop Japan in Asia—by refusing to sell to Italy and cutting off her communications with East Africa. In fact, the British navy could do it. But this, like any application of sanctions, would amount to war against Italy. It would throw Mussolini into the arms of Hitler. And the Western Powers are depending—rather precariously, it would seem—upon Il Duce to protect Austria against the penetration of the Nazis.

So Great Britain could not decide her future course of action on the basis of simple duty as a member of the League. She had first to find out whether France would keep her promise. If the two nations presented a solid front, Mussolini might yield before it was too late. But France apparently cast her lot with Italy in this matter. She had been counting on firm British help against further arming by Hitlerized Germany. She had so interpreted Britain's promise at Stresa. Meanwhile the British statesmen had gone off alone and made an agreement with Hitler allowing him to increase his navy, once again in violation of the Versailles Treaty. The French believed that this meant Great Britain was an unreliable ally, that, in fact, she might be preparing to throw over the League altogether and remain neutral in case Hitler carried out his well known plan to conquer territory on his Eastern frontier. France consequently preferred to strengthen her ties with Italy. She will apparently let Italy violate her promise to the League in return for Italy's promise to help her in the event of trouble in Europe. She will do this because Germany violated her promise to the League and to the victorious allies, with the consent of Great Britain, granted in violation of her promise at Stresa. If France does this, however, she will incur a heavy moral loss. The League, broken down by its failure to stop Japan, and virtually killed by the defection of Germany, will need only to be buried if it fails in this new and clearest of cases. And France has been firm in her support of the League and its logic as a protection of the Versailles status in Europe.

Italy, like Japan, is morally bound not only by the League Covenant but by her signature on the Kellogg-Briand Pact, by which she promised never to make aggressive war on anybody. That great achievement in the cause of perpetual peace has always been considered little more than a polite gesture by practical statesmen, because nobody knew what, if anything, would happen if it were violated. Ethiopia, however, grasping at straws in her extremity, sent an appeal to Washington and invoked the pact. Secretary Hull lived up to the amenities by expressing confidence that Italy would keep her promise, and that the League would settle the dispute. Almost at the same time, the Department of State warned American citizens to leave Ethiopia.

One explanation of this failure of peace machinery is good, so far as it goes. The nations that are satisfied with the territory they have conquered in the past, nations like France, Great Britain, Russia and the United States, will honestly try to keep the peace—on the basis of the status quo. The nations that are still unsatisfied with the dimensions of their empires, nations like Germany, Japan and Italy, will press forward to gain territory, and will fight for it if they cannot get it peaceably, promises or no promises. The satisfied nations are likely to fight to prevent this outcome, promises or no promises, when the unsatisfied nations step on their toes. Japan and Germany have already cynically repudiated the comity of nations, and Italy is about to do so. The complications arising from this situation continually threaten a general conflict, from one source or another.

If one stopped with this analysis, the remedy would seem clear. It is to devise a way of satisfying the unsatisfied without involving the world in war. Let Japan have China. Let Italy have Ethiopia. Rearrange the map of Central Europe in the interest of Germany. When all nations are placated—except the weaker victims of such a process—a League of Nations would work. This seems to be the formula on the basis of which British realists are now proceeding. Mr. Brailsford's article in this issue of The New Republic indicates that they are applying it particularly in the case of Germany. They hope for reconciliation by sanctioning renewed German strength and a revision of the admittedly unsound and impermanent settlement of 1919.

The trouble is, however, that in a world of imperialist and capitalist nations it is impossible to satisfy everybody at once. Britain's plan cannot be carried out without a collision between Germany and France, or between Germany and Russia, to mention only two of the major possibilities. As long as the United States' policy is oriented towards capitalist exploitation of China, we are in continual danger of a collision with Japan, as Japan pushes forward.

A capitalist nation cannot indefinitely keep its machinery going without new markets and new op-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

portunities for investment of capital. It cannot arrange a self-compensating economy at home, after it has fully developed its own resources. This is the primary impulse towards conquest. It is naïve to place the blame on the personal wickedness of fascist dictators in Germany and Italy or a fascist militarism in Japan. For fascism is only one of the late disguises of capitalism, in its hunger to fight and to devour.

Self-Help for the Unemployed

MR. UPTON SINCLAIR, in his open letter to President Roosevelt published in a recent issue of The New Republic, again raises a question that has received much consideration in various quarters—the possibility of instituting a program of self-help for the unemployed. Dramatized by Mr. Sinclair in his Epic campaign, this method of relief has won many supporters but, despite the various discussions of the subject, it has seldom been noted that such a program has already been adopted by the federal government and that it has been functioning in forty-five different states.

A detailed report of this phase of relief administration is contained in The Congressional Record for March 19, having been read into the document by Senator Cutting. The report, prepared by members of Mr. Hopkins' staff, reveals that of the 1,600,000 persons on work relief on November 15, approximately 15 percent were employed in the production of goods and that there were 7,650 projects in operation throughout the country. These were as follows:

Clothing, sewing of garments, etc.	2,348
Food, canning and preserving	1,217
Fuel, cutting wood, digging peat, etc.	434
Garden projects	576
Household goods	738
Construction materials	75
Other projects	2,262

During the succeeding month there were some changes in the number of projects, but they remained approximately the same. Production for December is shown in the following:

Total meat and meat products	$7,409,042
Total fruit and vegetables	525,931
Total other food products	10,708
Total clothing	583,626
House furnishings	1,834,412
Miscellaneous	165,736
Total	$10,529,089

This report, however, was prepared before complete production figures for December had been received. Jacob Baker, assistant administrator, who submitted the report to Senator Cutting, estimates it to be about 60 percent of the total, making the latter approximately $18,000,000.

In regard to efficiency, which is one of the questions always raised in any discussion of self-help for the unemployed: it appears that efficiency is primarily dependent upon organization and the retraining of workers whose skill has been impaired by idleness. The report reads:

> Cost data have not been kept accurately by all the local administrations on their work programs, but on the whole expenses are the same as with contracts. . . . The nearest approach we have to a specific record of efficiency is in the case of the Ohio relief production units, where the Ohio relief administration is using vacant and idle plants and manning them with relief labor. The December returns of these plants show the total value of goods produced, if they had been sold, at $132,000 produced at a total cost of $126,000. The goods, of course, were not sold but distributed to relief clients.

These figures, as observed by Senator Cutting, indicate the possibility of cutting the present cost of relief by enlarging the self-help program. The report says:

> The average expenditure for relief of funds from all sources is approximately $165,000,000 a month. We began with that as a basis and the fact that 42 percent of the clients were on work relief. By planning a program to put as many as possible to work and for them to produce as much of their own needs as possible through rental of idle equipment, it appears that the same relief benefits that cost $163,000,000 could be readily produced for $60,000,000. If these benefits were increased 35 percent, it would bring them to a respectable standard of subsistence at a total cash outlay of $78,000,000 a month.

The report is calculated, by and large, to offer much support to the proponents of the self-help method of relief. It has much to recommend it—not only its apparent economy but its larger social value derived from putting men to work at their own trades and crafts. As a means of alleviating the pressure of the depression, however, its value is dubious. Whenever an unemployed man is put to work to make something that the government would otherwise buy to distribute for relief, an employed man loses a job.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1935, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 40 EAST 49TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY. BRUCE BLIVEN, PRESIDENT, DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER.

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

HAMILTON BASSO H. N. BRAILSFORD JOHN DEWEY
JOHN T. FLYNN WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN
W. P. MANGOLD JON. MITCHELL LEWIS MUMFORD
R. G. TUGWELL

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain Veers Toward Germany

WHITEHALL has just witnessed an unusual meeting between British and German naval officers. With the utmost good nature they have fixed the tonnage with which each of them shall enter the next world war. For every hundred tons that the British launch as targets for German shells and torpedoes, the Germans shall have thirty-five tons, charged with all the instruments of destruction that civilization has devised. This agreement was reached promptly, with big-hearted Nordic gestures; both sides were satisfied as they surveyed their future fleets, and to the general contentment of the British nation, after prayers had been said, the papers were laid on the table of the House of Commons. In Glasgow and Liverpool the owners and architects of the shipyards reckon with complacency on the building of the merchant ships that will offer their hulls to the submarines Mr. Baldwin has allotted to Hitler.

Since the French officers at Fontenoy bowed to the British and invited them to fire first, Europe has seen no more singular spectacle than this. What does it mean? Some weeks back, when Mr. Churchill was thundering against the contrite National Government for the inadequacy of its aerial armaments, the assumption prevailed that Germany would again be the enemy in the next war. If that be so, then these genial naval gentlemen, who met in Whitehall, were commendably courteous and accommodating in their enmity. The conduct of the Germans was perfectly intelligible. It was revealed to Herr Hitler, during his meditations in the trenches, that the capital mistake of the Kaiser was to challenge British sea power. He has, therefore, as he tells us in "Mein Kampf," devised a policy of Continental expansion eastwards, which neither offends the British Empire nor requires a supreme navy. On this view his naval representatives acted in London. They obtained British approval for a fleet of considerable but not dangerous strength, and they met all the stipulations of the British experts with the most accommodating good will.

The master stroke of their diplomacy consisted in defining German naval strength as a percentage of British strength. Henceforward in conferences and conversations the two nations stand interlocked with identical interests, advancing and receding together in the face of the rest of the world. The Germans have a stake in promoting British power at sea, while the English sense of fair play will see to it that the Germans are not defrauded of their full 35 percent in battleships, crusiers, airplane carriers and even submarines, though in this last category comes the most surprising concession of all, for here the Germans may claim with British consent anything from 45 percent to parity. One good turn deserves another: these obliging Nazi gentlemen will back the British in asking for a limit of 25,000 tons on the battleships of the future.

All this was in line with everything we know or divine about Nazi policy: it aims at detaching Great Britain from the Powers that must oppose German expansion. But what are we to think of the British performance? Less than a month before this talk in Whitehall, the British at the League's Council in Geneva joined the French and Italians in reciting, in bands, gown and surplice, a solemn commination service over Herr Hitler, because he had torn up the Versailles Treaty without the consent of all its signatories. They joined, too, in the threat (somewhat vague, it is true) of an economic blockade, if he should ever do it again. And now they have actually helped him to do it again. One may, in one's own inner consciousness, rejoice to see this miserable treaty torn to tatters by British as well as German hands. But other states, more than a score of them, have rights in this matter, which the breezy gentlemen in Whitehall ignored. Or did they feel that in a matter of this kind it is understood that Britannia rules the waves?

The anger of the French at this proceeding is as intelligible as Nazi policy. That resolution at Geneva was of their drafting: they were simple enough to suppose that it had a meaning. They thought, too, that at Stresa they had arranged with Britain and Italy a common front against German ambitions. The manner in which this pact came into being without their assent was bad: but its contents are no better. For the British should have recollected that in assigning to the Germans 35 percent of their own naval strength, they were consenting to German naval parity with France, or to something very near it. This may be reasonable in itself, but it happens that the French, without reckoning colonies, have two seacoasts to defend, while the Germans have only one. Nor is that the whole of the initial disparity between the two: the Germans have a greater merchant marine on which to draw, and a more highly developed building industry. The French reaction, then, is to say that they will have to claim something beyond the ratio for capital ships assigned to them at Washington. That will have consequences. It is not the way of the Italians to allow themselves to be distanced by the French navy: they, too, will claim an increase. The British, in their turn, who claim superiority over any two Continental Powers, will thereupon enlarge their program. At this point one perceives the subtlety of German tactics. For they will next be entitled to a percentage addition, proportionate to any British increase. So we go on, as musicians

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

say, *da capo,* till at sea the armaments race becomes a mad, unending tarantella, with British and Germans dancing as inseparable partners.

One need not take this prospect of indefinite competitive building too gravely: some time will pass before the Germans can build up to their allowance, if, indeed, they can ever afford to do so. What is grave is the repercussion of this agreement on the mutual relationship among the European Powers. The French had been persuaded with some difficulty to back at Geneva the timid and belated effort of the British to stop the conquest of Ethiopia on which Italy is bent. They did so, not from any humanitarian concern, but on the sound calculation that if the Italians, whose military capacity no one in Paris rates high, should tie up their army in this difficult adventure, Hitler may think the moment ripe for some enterprising stroke in Austria. That prudent reckoning they now in their anger forget. After obliging the British at Geneva, who have their own considerable stake in the rains of the Ethiopian highlands, which feed the Nile and Egypt's cotton fields, they are now rewarded by this naval agreement. There is therefore a tendency in Paris to shout *"Vive Mussolini!"* and some go so far as to suggest an open Franco-Italian alliance.

The French aim at securing themselves, with such disguises as Genevan prudery may suggest, by two trustworthy alliances, one in the East, the other in the West. If the British, whom they would trust more readily, are not prepared for the latter role, then the inevitable substitute must be sought at Rome, where, indeed, all the preliminary soundings were taken some months ago. The effect of this new mood in Paris may not be to precipitate an Italian attack on Ethiopia, though even of this one cannot be sure. The more likely consequence is that in one way or another the League may be used to impose on Ethiopia a surrender that would differ only in name from a conquest. The latest suggestion, that Italy should be given a League mandate over Ethiopia, is rather too crude to succeed. More specious is the alternative plan of authorizing Mussolini to build a railway across this country, encircling its capital and provided with a wide belt of territory to be policed by Italian troops. If once, by military and diplomatic pressure, Ethiopia is driven to accept this cynical solution, her fate will run exactly parallel to Manchuria's.

There is no mystery about the German state of mind, or the French. But of what is the British governing class thinking? There is an unknown quantity here. Sir Samuel Hoare, who steered the Indian Constitution through Parliament with hard-headed capacity, has succeeded Sir John Simon at the Foreign Office. He is a Tory of the Center, a traditional mind, yet not averse from a cautious liberalism that sacrifices none of the essentials of Empire. He was promoted for services rendered, but what detailed views on foreign policy, if any, he may hold, only his intimates know. Was this naval performance an indiscretion that the Foreign Office failed to control because an inexperienced pilot held the wheel, or did it mark a conscious reorientation of British policy?

This writer does not pretend to have a confident answer to the question. It is probable that the Foreign Office was lacking in foresight and imagination, and did not intend either to offend the French or to back German ambitions unreservedly. None the less, a reorientation of British feeling towards Germany is going on with big and visible strides. It was puzzling to many students of British policy that the traditional preference for a balance of power in Europe was so slow in manifesting itself after the World War. British policy was always less harsh than French, and prompter in its adjustments, but it took no risks and used no pressure, beyond verbal remonstrances. This is explicable enough. There could be no balance of power, since Germany was powerless. Today, she has snatched power: a balance may be attainable.

The first effect of the exhibition of Nazi barbarism was to cause throughout the British Isles a shudder of apprehension and disgust. When in the early days of the dictatorship, the arch-francophile of the Tory Party, Sir Austen Chamberlain, delivered a passionate oration against it, the whole House of Commons was with him. The other day, when he ended a similar speech with a plain threat of war, the House perceptibly winced. Time blunts the edge of humane indignation, when no interest whets it. The signs of a change are many. The Times, after a discreet silence of sixteen years, discovers all the iniquities of the Versailles Treaty. Sincere Liberals of Lord Lothian's type, who had no audience a few years ago, are now heard with respectful attention when they advocate revision, even territorial revision. The popular Tory middle-class daily, Lord Rothermere's Daily Mail, conducts a cult of the Führer. The Prince of Wales, boldly abandoning the rule of silence imposed on the royal family, advocates reconciliation in a moving speech. The war veterans are arranging a pilgrimage to Germany, and the German veterans, landing at Dover, receive an emotional welcome.

All this, as a popular impulse, is genuine and wholly creditable. It means shame for the harsh peace, and a resolve to avoid another war with that same enemy. The older generation of Chamberlains and Churchills, who took this so-called peace to be a mere truce, like the intervals that broke the eighteenth-century wars with France, are repudiated by the main stream of public opinion. There is a wish for something more original. The average man would phrase it as a square deal for Germany and the restoration of the League. In technical language this is not easy to translate. My own suspicion is that it will come in practice to something perilously like the traditional policy of the balance, with results that may not make for peace. The first essay at Whitehall is far from promising.

London. H. N. BRAILSFORD.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Soviets Take Stock

THE SEVENTH All-Union Congress is in session. Chairman Molotov, of the People's Commissars, is winding up a two-hour report: " . . . we can say to our friends that the Soviet Union is now greater than ever in its economic might and in the solidarity of the toiling masses around the Soviet power. . . . Our Stalin is leading the million-strong masses and we firmly know that this is the road to our complete victory." Thunderous applause bursts forth in the great hall of the Kremlin. It turns into an ovation as two thousand delegates stand and shout: "Long live the great Stalin! Long live Comrade Molotov!"

It is four years since the last general stock-taking, four difficult, crucial years. The Sixth Congress, too, reported progress, was wildly enthusiastic and proclaimed the triumph of socialism. But then the mood was one of feverish excitement, of ardor and determination. It was the mood of the First Five Year Plan, half-completed, with its short rations and heroism, with the future hanging in the balance. In 1935 confidence and security pervade the atmosphere. Not that the Seventh Congress fails to recognize that much still remains to be done; but the delegates who cheer Molotov know that a decisive battle has been won, that the foundations of the Soviet Union are now solidly established. The rest of the world, hostile or friendly, knows this too and must take it into account. At any rate, the facts are there for all who care to look.

All the concrete accomplishments—and the failures—of the Soviets during the last four years are linked with the closing period of the First Five Year Plan and the first two years of the Second. While there has been no real break or dividing line between the two plans, the Second called for special emphasis on light industry, that is, consumers' products. Here, however, the Soviets admit only a partial success. The last four years show an increase of 150 percent in consumers' goods, on the whole a gratifying gain, but not up to demand. Last year production in light industries was up 5.2 percent and in the food industry over 21 percent, but both figures failed to fulfill the Plan. For 1935 the Commissariat for Light Industry must increase output by almost 12 percent and the Commissariat for Food Industry is ordered to step up production by nearly 15 percent. In both of these branches, the government complains, quality as well as quantity is considerably behind schedule.

There are many reasons, including incompetence and bureaucracy, why the Second Five Year Plan lags in those very departments the Plan had stressed. However, the chief cause probably lies in the fact that heavy industry still absorbs the principal energies of the nation. This is far from saying that the second Five Year Plan, in terms of the Soviet Union's general economy, has thus far been a failure. What it reveals is that general world conditions have stimulated greater activity than had been anticipated in those industries which produce the means of supplying submarines, artillery, airplanes, tanks, munitions, etc. What it further reveals is an almost foolhardy confidence in the loyalty and endurance of the masses, whose legitimate wants and needs remain only partially satisfied because of this diversion of energy.

The necessity for that shift of emphasis, endangering as it did the chief objectives of the Plan, is not questioned very seriously. After all, the "contradictions" of the capitalist world, which the Bolsheviks are fond of pointing out, affect the destinies of the Soviet Union in no small degree. The fact remains, however, that the growth of Russia's heavy industry during the last four years, and particularly during 1934, is the principal reason for the air of optimism that brightened the Seventh Congress.

In the words of Molotov, the "victory in the iron and steel industry," especially during 1934, must be considered as the Soviet's most important economic—and political—success. The production of iron during the past four years increased 110 percent and reached the enormous figure of 10,500,000 tons; of this, last year accounted for more than a third of the total gain. Russia now ranks second only to the United States in world production of iron. Steel output increased 66 percent, reaching 9,600,000 tons, while the production of rolled steel went up 49 percent with a total of 6,700,000 tons; in both cases the past year was responsible for about a third of the sum.

In more general terms, the whole level of Soviet industrial production has increased 77 percent since 1931 and 139 percent since 1929; this in the face of only a 2-percent gain for the rest of the world since 1931 and a 24-percent loss since 1929. The comparison is of course not entirely relevant. Apart from questions of basic stimuli and incentives to produce, conditions quite unrelated to the nature of the two opposing systems of economy must be considered. In 1929, at the brink of the depression, industrial expansion and the exploitation of natural resources in the chief capitalist countries reached the apex of a hundred-year period of intense development. Russia, embarking on its First Five Year Plan in 1929, was a backward country, starting almost at scratch. Besides, we have seen similar industrial progress, on a smaller and less spectacular scale, to be sure, in backward Turkey and Palestine.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

All these figures, however, do reveal the amazing speed of Soviet development and stress the fact that the fundamental strength of the Soviet industrial system lies in its rapidly expanding heavy branches. Weak units, nevertheless, exist and are freely admitted—for example, oil, copper, tin and lumber. The weakest link is undoubtedly the transport system, and in case of war this might cause serious embarrassment. Commissar Ordjonikidze, of the division of Heavy Industry, reported to the Soviet Congress that 450,000 carloads of manufactured goods were congesting warehouses.

During the past four years, freight turnover increased only 32 percent, obviously lagging far behind the vast increase in the load to be carried. Worse still, the percentage of the run of empty cars in relation to the total movement of cars actually grew larger in 1934. One bright spot in the transportation picture is the Far Eastern Territory, where strategic reasons urgently demanded action. Here the completion of the unfinished second track of the Trans-Siberian road and the beginning of a new Baikal-Amur line accompanied the most intensive military preparations. The appointment of Lazar Kaganovich, one of the "strong men" of the Soviet regime, as the new Commissar for Transportation, is the signal for a desperate campaign to raise the efficiency of the railroad system this year. Kaganovich will have a budget of 4,000,000,000 rubles (about 20 rubles per gold dollar) at his disposal.

Whatever the future has in store for Russia, its transformation into an industrial power is already an accomplished fact. What it cost the great masses of the country in terms of want, hardship, sacrifice and loss of life can probably never be adequately described. Yet the role of industrialization in converting feudal Russia into a new modern Westernized Soviet state cannot be overestimated. Externally, industrialized Russia deeply affects the economic and political balance of the whole world. Internally its influence is even more profound.

An extraordinarily concise and complete account —more eloquent than a dozen books—of what has taken place in Russia since the Tsar's time was made public at the Seventh All-Union Congress. It is a table of statistics recording the class composition of the country's population at three well chosen intervals. We reproduce the table below:

	Class composition of population in percentages of the total (within the present borders of the U.S.S.R.) in:		
	1913	1928	1934
PROLETARIAT (workers, employees, engineers, and technicians' sector and remaining proletarian population):	16.7	17.3	28.1
Including:			
a) industrial proletariat and employees in industry, transport, building, social-cultural establishments and government apparatus:	[12.4]	[15.8]	[24.9]
b) agricultural proletariat:	[4.3]	[1.5]	[3.2]
COLLECTIVE FARMERS and craftsmen and artisans organized in coöperatives:	—	2.9	45.9
INDIVIDUAL PEASANTS (exclusive of kulaks) and artisans and craftsmen not organized in coöperatives:	65.1	72.9	22.5
BOURGEOISIE (landowners, large and small city bourgeoisie, merchants and kulaks):	15.9	4.5	.1
Of which kulaks:	[12.3]	[3.7]	[0.09]
REMAINING POPULATION (students, army, pensioners and others):	2.3	2.4	3.4
TOTAL POPULATION In thousands of people:	139,300	152,352	168,000

If we compare the figures for the agricultural population in 1913 and in 1928, we see that little real change took place. The kulaks were reduced from 12.3 percent to 3.7 percent, but a corresponding gain, from 65.1 percent to 72.9 percent, took place for the rest of the individual peasantry. Along with this nearly static condition we notice even less change in the relative proportions of the proletariat.

But in 1934, after a six-year period of industrialization, the whole complexion of the population had undergone radical change. A rise in the industrial population from 17.3 percent to 28.1 percent, apparently not a tremendous shift in relation to the entire mass, reveals its true significance in the completely altered aspect of the agricultural workers, who in both periods represent approximately 70 percent of the entire population. By the end of 1934 some four-fifths of the peasantry had been collectivized and—what the table does not indicate —nine-tenths of the cultivated area of the Soviet Union had become collective and state farms.

The collectivization of Soviet agriculture, which is bound to be total in a short time, is one of the major results of the industrial program. Collectivization, under the conditions the Soviets faced, would have been a complete failure unless accompanied by mechanization. It was heavy industry that built and supplied the tractor plants that in turn furnished collective farms with over 100,000 tractors and other machines during the past four years. For 1935 the program calls for 65,000 tractors, 10,000 motor vehicles and 14,000 combines.

As for practical results in terms of crops, the following item will serve to illustrate how Russia's modernized agriculture works. In 1933, the first year of relative stabilization under the new scheme, the total grain harvest exceeded that of 1913 (in the same territory within the borders of the present U.S.S.R.) by 590,000,000 poods (a pood is approximately 36 pounds). And 1913 was considered an exceptionally good harvest year! Again, in 1913, over 600,000,000 poods of grain were exported, while in 1934, with a net increase over the previous year of nearly 300,000,000 poods (and this in spite of a serious drought in the Ukraine), only 60,000,000 poods left the country. This made

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

possible the recent abolition of the bread card, one of the notable improvements in the Soviet standard of living.

Soviet agriculture is definitely on its feet, in spite of weak points which the government is prompt to recognize. Technical and organizational incompetence are still not uncommon. The cotton, flax, beet and other less important crops are still far from satisfactory. The Seventh Congress emphasized very clearly the immediate importance of increasing livestock breeding. Here only some timid signs of improvement appeared during the past year. For 1935 the Second Five Year Plan calls for a gross agricultural increase of 16.4 percent over the preceding year, perhaps the most ambitious task of the Plan.

Returning to our table of population statistics, we can see that the thoroughgoing transformation of the Soviet economy in an incredibly short period of time is matched by a simultaneous—and no less rapid or radical—shift in the social status of the Russian people. Up to 1929 and after more than a decade of Bolshevik rule, 75 percent of the population still functioned as individualists and capitalists. This figure differs very little from that of 1913. It is true that one important change had taken place by 1928 without which the initial survival of the Soviet regime would have been impossible: the reduction of those groups listed under "Bourgeoisie" from almost 16 percent to less than 5 percent of the total population. Yet this "revolutionary" shift was almost counterbalanced by the increase of individual peasants, a Pyrrhic victory for the Bolsheviks, since a large individualistic peasantry would have been a permanent obstacle barring the way to communism.

Here the fundamental social significance of the First and Second Five Year Plans is revealed. Industrialization and its adjunct, the mechanization of agriculture, not only built up national power, but opened the way for Communism. The year 1935 finds three-quarters of the Russian people living collectivized, socialized lives. Socialism in the daily life of the people is no longer a theory, but a concrete reality. It is difficult to visualize what this means in terms of altered habits of living and thinking, of new social relationships, of individual and mass psychologies. It is quite useless any longer to speak of the impossibility of changing human nature. Russia's new class distribution must be counted as one of the most important sources of strength of the present government. It is on this basis that the Seventh Congress altered the Constitution to provide for the secret ballot, the direct vote and equal representation for collective farmers and factory workers.

The figures on Russia's military establishment presented at the Seventh Congress are impressive. An increase in the air force of 330 percent, of 200 percent in heavy artillery, over 2,000 percent in baby tanks and more than 700 percent in large tanks, 535 percent in submarines, 470 percent in torpedo boats, the completion of heavy fortifications on the Eastern and Western frontiers, the establishment of a huge munitions industry and a standing army of 940,000 men—these are the quantitative measurements. Of equal importance, however, in judging the potential strength of Russia's armed forces is the fact that foreign military observers are unanimous in their opinion that improvement in *quality* has matched that of size. In other words, the Soviet military machine is not only one of the largest and most highly mechanized in the world, but it is one of the most efficient.

In spite of its formidable power to wage war, it is generally admitted that Russia today is one of the largest single factors in preserving the peace of Europe. Soviet foreign policy since 1927, that is, since the banishment of Trotsky, has definitely been based on the propositions that: (a) there is no immediate prospect of worldwide communist revolution; (b) one or more of the capitalist powers are likely sooner or later to attack the Soviet Union; (c) Russia must have peace as long as possible in order to build up her defenses and develop her natural and human resources.

As a matter of fact, the last thing that can be said of Russian policy is that it is sentimental or idealistic. True, the Soviet Union still insists that it is the "fatherland" of the world's proletariat. In one of his speeches to the Seventh Congress, Molotov spoke of expecting to "see in the camp of our friends a flow of new energy and faith in the cause of communism" *(stormy applause)*. But for all practical purposes Russia is no more concerned with active participation in the world communist movement than is J. P. Morgan. Though the headquarters of the Third International remain in Moscow, the Soviet government has gone to great pains to dissociate itself from all such activity in order not to jeopardize relations with capitalist countries. Russia leaves the world revolution for the outside world to take care of, justifying herself by saying that any other course would endanger the Soviet Union and that the Soviet Union must be preserved as the world's first and foremost stronghold of communism.

What it all comes down to is that the Soviet Union has "come of age." With industrialism as its magic formula, it has transformed itself a remarkably short time into a first-class power. Internally this has meant the possibility of establishing a new social order. Externally, it means that it has joined the family of nations, not only as the exponent of a social theory, but as a nation, far more coherent than old imperial Russia, far more vital, the nation that Alexis de Tocqueville envisaged over a hundred years ago when his visit to the United States led him to predict that some day Europe would find itself squeezed between the jaws of a mighty vise: America on the West and Russia on the East.

CLYDE O. HUNTER.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Good Giant and the A.A.A.

PUBLIC opinion, which once upon a time was only a symbolic figure in cartoons, has become a valuable commercial property. The banners and buttons of World War propaganda showed, as one writer has explained, "the possibilities of molding public opinion toward an objective. Its success convinced leaders how vital it is to gauge public reaction to ideas or products; how necessary it is to get public support." And big business, having learned the technique of selling its products, is now trying to sell itself. Certain corporations, of course, have been doing so-called institutional advertising for a long time, and various associations have been formed to propagandize products made by its members.

It was not until the New Deal was invented, however, that a group of corporations, united by the same interest (profits) and faced with a common threat (the loss of profits) banded together to sell themselves, in their total identity, as a good, gentle giant, interested in protecting widows, orphans and the common man. The activity of the utilities is a case in point, and the effort of various industries to prevent the adoption of the Child Labor Amendment is another. The most recent instance, however, is the attempt of the Agricultural Industries' Conference, the American Association of Creamery Butter Manufacturers, Swift and Company, the United States Chamber of Commerce and the American Liberty League to kill two proposed amendments (S. 1807 and H. R. 5585) to the A.A.A. These amendments, against which the processing interests have formed a united front, have been proposed in order to make the A.A.A. more effective. They were, originally, much more drastic than they are at present, having been subjected to considerable revision after the Supreme Court invalidated the N.R.A. The original report of the Committee on Agriculture reads:

> The primary objective set forth in the declaration of policy in the Agricultural Adjustment Act is to secure parity prices for farm products through balancing production with consumption. . . . These amendments will permit a more flexible program by permitting the use of different plans with reference to different commodities. . . . The word "adjustment" has been substituted for the word "reduction" so that the production of a crop hereafter may be adjusted to our domestic and foreign market demand rather than being based on the question of reduction alone. It may mean an increase or a decrease, or neither, depending upon the supply necessary to fit the general market demand.

The Good Giants.—The groups that have been trying to kill the amendments are principally those that have opposed farm legislation from the first. Fountainhead of the propaganda flood is a body calling itself the Legislative Committee, Agricultural Industries' Conference. This Conference has never revealed the interests behind it, but on the covers of its innumerable leaflets it tries to identify itself with agriculture by saying it represents "the major groups in the agricultural industries" brought together at the invitation of the United States Chamber of Commerce. The Conference has prepared and distributed pamphlets, one addressed to farmers and one to business men, and has maintained a publicity office in Washington which issues daily press releases. Its pamphlet for the farmer begins:

> An adroitly worded legislative proposal is found by careful analysis to contain dangerous, arbitrary and autocratic powers over farmer-producers, manufacturers and distributors of agricultural products and derivatives. . . . Under the licensing system set out in the bill no farmer can fail to feel the effect of restrictive requirements in his own marketing operations. In fact, farmers who do not sign the allocation and crop-restricting contracts may be entirely without a market. The small farmers producing diversified crops—for whose benefit the whole force of agricultural effort has been directed for the past generation—may be disastrously affected. Even if this is not specifically intended, the possibilities of the language of these amendments are sufficiently broad to give an administrative official this power.

Other arguments presented are that the amendments would mark the end of voluntary coöperation, that farmers' coöperatives would be "wholly and completely subject to the arbitrary licensing provisions" and that instead of benefit payments the government might "pay corn or wheat farmers by presenting them with supplies of raw cotton."

The leaflet addressed to business men begins: "Broad Powers to License a Large Section of American Business, Even Against Its Will, Are Proposed in Amendments to Agricultural Adjustment Act." This leaflet pictures Secretary Wallace as a merciless giant controlling a great percentage of the nation's business, and the Agricultural Industries' Conference as the good giant who doesn't want the bad giant to get away with it. The leaflet argues that the amendments hold the threat of licenses not only over 110,000 processors and 52,500 wholesalers, but also over 811,000 retailers. "A broad interpretation of the proposed amendments would bring within their scope practically all manufacturing establishments in the United States with the possible exception of iron and steel and a few isolated other kinds of plants."

One keeps wondering, reading such material, who the good giant, so interested in the welfare of the farmer and the little business man, really is. A

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clue is given by the names of those associations represented at the committee hearings on the bill in Congress. These include the Institute of American Meat Packers; Millers' National Federation; American Creamery Butter Manufacturers' Association; American Feed Manufacturers' Association; Dairy Industries Committee; The Cotton Textile Institute; National Canners' Association; Associated Grocery Manufacturers.

If any of these associations, however, are backing the Agricultural Industries' Conference, the cat has not been let out of the good giant's bag. The good giant, as far as the public is concerned, just strode into Washington and began protecting the American people against the machinations of Secretary Wallace. It's almost a miracle.

The Good Giant's Helpers.—Although the Agricultural Industries' Conference is wrapped in a cloak of anonymity, other groups and corporations seeking to defeat the amendments are not. Swift and Company, in a report to its stockholders signed by G. T. Swift as president, made no bones about its opposition:

> These bills would permit a complete dictatorship over the processors of agricultural products—a dictatorship without parallel in the history of this country. . . . There is practically no limit to what an unwise dictatorship could do to the competitive structure of the meat and other agricultural industries. No regard whatever need be shown for the trade position a company has earned through competitive struggle over a period of years or for the property rights of shareholders. . . . Several millions of shareholders and employees are dependent upon the agricultural processing and food industries for their income and livelihood. . . . If you wish to have your views regarding this legislation considered, you should write your Senators and Congressmen. If you do this, you may wish to explain the situation to your friends and ask them to do likewise. Congress is now considering these bills. Prompt action on your part is necessary if you want your views to be effective.

The American Association of Creamery Butter Manufacturers is another group that has come out in the open to attack the amendments. Besides urging its own membership to write Senators and Congressmen, this organization has prepared literature to be distributed "in any quantity" among farmers. "Service Bulletin No. 392," dated February 27, 1935, along with the usual data on butter prices and similar information contained arguments against the thirty-hour-week bill and the A.A.A. amendments. "We are also having prepared and printed," it went on, "a short statement to be circulated among farmers. There will be a large quantity of these. The farmers should know the danger that is confronting their business as cream producers. You may order any quantity you desire of these statements from this office, and the thing to do is to lose no time, but get busy at once."

The bulletin also suggests that

> creameries in every state should get together and raise a defense fund. Congress and state legislatures are going entirely too far—trying to regulate everything. Someone from every state possible should come to Washington and spend a few days seeing members of Congress on the five-day-week work bill, agricultural-dictator bill, etc., and perhaps appear as a witness at hearings. Those who come, please contact A. M. Loomis, 630 Indiana Avenue. [Loomis is secretary of the National Dairy Union and is one of Washington's veteran lobbyists.]

On April 22, the American Liberty League came to the aid of the processing industries with a pamphlet, "The A.A.A. Amendments," and a press release issued from Washington. Both characterized the proposed legislation as working toward "a fascist control not only of agriculture but of a major sector of the manufacturing and distributing industries." The League's pamphlet, like the releases of the Agricultural Industries' Conference, said that the amendments would enable the Secretary of Agriculture to "take over . . . the virtual management of far-flung industries engaged in canning, milling, brewing, distilling, meat packing, textile manufacturing, cotton-seed crushing, soap making and the manufacture of sugars, feeds, tobacco products, various foods, fertilizers and automobile tires, as well as truckers, commission houses, distributors and retailers handling all kinds of farm products." It also avows the great concern of the Liberty League for the welfare of sharecroppers, tenants and farm laborers—a concern that is even more remarkable when the personnel of the League is remembered.

The United States Chamber of Commerce, in a set of resolutions adopted on May 2, also entered the by now crowded arena as one of the Good Giant's helpers. The Chamber could not completely adjust itself to its unaccustomed role, for it declared that it would insist that "the government shall not, by law, or otherwise, give preferential treatment to any group." It made it explicit, however, that this doctrine of "no preference" is to refer only to agriculture. In the same set of resolutions the Chamber filed a special plea for a subsidized merchant marine; nor did its indignation regarding "preferential treatment" extend to the various handouts given by the government to big business.

Rebuttal.—The answer returned by those persons who want the amendments passed is simple enough. Without the amendments, the entire marketing-agreement and licensing programs of the A.A.A. would have more loop-holes than substance and would probably have to be abandoned. And nothing would please the Good Giant more than that—which is the moral and climax of our tale. A secondary moral, which needs little stressing, is that the only good giants are to be found in story books—not lobbying in Washington.

ALEXANDER FARMER.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What the Working Class Reads

SOME TIME ago Mr. Louis Adamic contributed to The Saturday Review of Literature a curious article called "What the Proletariat Reads"—curious because in spite of its title and subtitle, "Conclusions Based on a Year's Study of Hundreds of Workers Throughout the United States," it had nothing whatever to do with what the proletariat reads. In fact, it was all about what the proletariat does *not* read, and since there are many books the proletariat does not read, has never heard of and does not give a damn about, it is obvious that Mr. Adamic has found a fresh approach to some of the more complex problems of literary criticism. In fairness to him, however, it should be said that he makes no attempt to deal with all the working class does not read—he is concerned with a few novels, generally called proletarian novels, which it does not read more markedly than it does not read others. Yet he tells us that "the overwhelming majority" of the American working class does not read "books or serious, purposeful magazines"; in fact, "hardly reads anything apart from the local Sunday and daily newspapers and an occasional copy of Liberty, True Romances, Wild West Tales or Screen Romances."

This is a serious indictment, not merely of the cultural development of the American working class, but of the cultural development of the country as a whole. To what extent is it justified? Mr. Adamic does not give the reasons for his sweeping charges, since he is primarily interested in discovering the exact extent to which the working class does not read such books as William Rollins' "The Shadow Before," Grace Lumpkin's "To Make My Bread," Catherine Brody's "Nobody Starves" and other works that fit into the same category of proletarian literature, which he defines as literature addressed to the working class. It may be observed in parenthesis that Mr. Adamic began his inquiry with a basic misunderstanding of what constitutes proletarian literature, and that his major premise—that its "strongest justification" is "that it is addressed to the working class"—would be disputed by most proletarian novelists and their critics. Proletarian or any other literature can only be "justified"—culturally, artistically—by the extent to which it advances the heritage of human culture; even, its defenders would insist, by the extent to which it promises to advance human culture, the extent to which it incorporates and hands on and revitalizes and makes significant to the present the great achievements of the human imagination. It is a cultural product and its value cannot be determined in any important way by the size of its immediate audience. Furthermore, none of the books whose readers—or lack of readers—Mr. Adamic analyzes are addressed to the working class in the sense that such publications as True Romances and Wild West Tales are addressed to the working class.

But the important question raised in Mr. Adamic's article is whether the working class, which means the majority of the population of the country, is inherently incapable of responding to a higher type of literature than that offered by the newspapers and cheap commercial publications. A novelist or a critic's opinion on this must be organically connected with his whole concept of the value and dignity of his effort. Few American critics have faced this issue as frankly as Mr. Adamic, or accepted so candidly the responsibilities of their decision.

If you believe, as Mr. Adamic believes, that because the broad masses of the working people accept a kind of cheap commercial fiction produced for their consumption, and at the same time do not respond to more serious works written in their interests, that they are therefore inherently incapable of responding to or taking part in any highly developed cultural activity, you must recognize the circumscribed program for literature in general that flows from such a belief. Creative literature becomes of such dubious value, its possibilities seem so limited in comparison with the strain and patience it demands, that the inspiration of the individual writer is constantly threatened by his sense of the social meaninglessness of his labor. The inspiration must be powerful indeed to keep him at his desk for the hours and days and years that his craft requires, if he is to reflect, whenever he looks around him, that the overwhelming majority of his countrymen are forever barred from any understanding of what he writes, or of the kind of writing that is encouraged because of what he writes. Even the powerful creative spirit that surged through Stephen Dedalus ebbed when he considered the ignorant Irish peasant, with his "red-rimmed horny eyes," upon whom his deepest insights must always be wasted—"I fear him!" Stephen cried. "It is with him I must struggle till he or I lie dead!" But between Stephen and the peasant there rose the barrier of language; how much sharper must be the dilemma of an American writer who feels himself permanently cut off from the better-educated masses of his own country, and who lives, moreover, in a world in which books are burned and banned, and murals ruthlessly destroyed? A sense of the futility of the finished work, a sense of the danger of a vast mass immobility and indifference, assaulting the imagination at its moments of greatest intensity, arrests and discourages it, leads to an intermittent

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

productivity or—the real "great tradition" of American literature—to complete silence and exhaustion.

This Mr. Adamic recognizes. To counteract it, he proposes that writers abandon the working class to its True Stories and its Wild West Tales, and address themselves to the middle class—indeed, that they write for the specific purpose of making large sections of the middle class "unfit" for fascism. But then, as if recognizing that no serious artist can find a sustained inspiration in the desire to make anybody unfit for anything, he adds:

> Or let the books be so written, with such honesty, truthfulness, scope and emotional sweep, that whoever will read them, regardless of class, if he has any soundness left in his mind and heart, will be filled with shame and indignation that we Americans, while creating a marvelous technical machine, have made such a mess of ourselves spiritually and culturally on this continent, which is still offering us the opportunity to build on it a great civilization.

These are brave words, though it is a little difficult to see how, after having made such spiritual and cultural messes of ourselves—on this continent—we can still be sound enough in mind and heart to heed them. Mr. Adamic is rightly logical, and if his premises—that the working class cannot nourish a highly developed culture, that the educated classes alone can provide a responsive and vital audience—are granted, his conclusions follow. But is it true that such magazines as True Stories give an accurate indication of the level of working-class culture? And is it true that the middle class alone makes up the admittedly small group of serious readers in American society?

Soon after Mr. Adamic's article appeared, there was published a little book called "Who Reads What?"[1] bearing directly on this problem and to some extent contradicting Mr. Adamic's findings. "Who Reads What?" had its origin in the desire of its author, who is president of the American Library Association and assistant librarian of the St. Louis Public Library, to discover the extent to which the work of Mark Twain is now read. After reading "The Ordeal of Mark Twain" and "Mark Twain's America"—both of which bored him—he wondered if anyone still read Twain, and—as he records with breath-taking simplicity—"accordingly" he "examined the records of 3,289 Mark Twain adult readers in the St. Louis Public Library." He found that Twain is still widely read in St. Louis, and inquiry of other librarians convinced him that at the present time Twain is the most popular writer in the country. He also found that the readers of Twain were almost entirely drawn from the working class, from the industrial proletariat or from the lowest-paid ranks of the white-collar workers. The representation of other classes was negligible. He then investigated 700 readers of Hardy, 341 readers of Shaw, an unstated number of readers of Sandburg, William James and the Greek classics, with similar results. He also corresponded with the borrowers of the different books in an effort to draw out expressions of what the readers "got out of" their reading, and publishes many of the letters. Some of them are badly phrased; some are mere reflections of prevailing highbrow opinions; some attempt rather highly developed critical appraisals.

Mr. Compton does not seem to understand the class division among the readers, and he does not generalize from his findings. He classifies the readers by occupations, but even in these unnecessarily complicated groupings the implications are plain. The readers of Twain, for instance, were about evenly divided between the industrial proletariat and the white-collar workers, with business and the professions—even if the teachers (102) are included with doctors, dentists, advertising men, insurance agents, ministers, etc.—totaling less than the factory workers. Exact figures on each group are impossible to ascertain from Mr. Compton's figures, but the overwhelming representation of the working class may be seen by comparing the readers from the industrial proletariat (214 factory workers, 317 unemployed, 48 laborers, 44 mechanics, 35 needleworkers, 65 "having to do with automobiles"—though this includes dealers—34 electricians, 96 in the building trades, etc.) and the white-collar workers (230 clerks, 134 stenographers, 40 bookkeepers, 17 typists, 20 messenger and office boys, 175 salesmen, 25 postal employees, etc.) with all other miscellaneous professional and business groups (28 insurance men, 10 manufacturers, 22 physicians, 12 dentists, 15 ministers, etc.). The findings on the readers of Hardy are not given in such detail; nevertheless it is worth noting that out of the seven hundred investigated almost two hundred were stenographers and salespeople, "mostly department-store clerks and neighborhood-grocery clerks"; that there were fewer lawyers than waitresses, fewer ministers than tailors.

The fact that most library readers of these "serious" books are members of the working class does not mean that they constitute an audience receptive to revolutionary or radical fiction. A taste for the higher achievements of bourgeois culture may, on the contrary, encourage rather backward political and cultural convictions on the part of the working-class reader, may tend to make him less class-conscious or lead to a feeling of superiority over other workers whose cultural interests are not so highly developed as his own. But it does suggest that, contrary to Mr. Adamic's thesis, there exists now, within the American working class, a growing and groping and eager audience, acquainted with the higher achievements of bourgeois culture and actually straining the resources of the library system in its search for intellectually ade-

[1] Who Reads What? by Charles H. Compton. Introduction by Dorothy Canfield Fisher. New York: H. W. Wilson Company. 117 pages. $1.25.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quate reading. The four hundred million books that are taken from the public libraries of the country each year go largely to students and to masses of readers that librarians characteristically describe as belonging in "the lower economic groups." The number has been falling off in the last few months, principally because the libraries are now running out of books—the $16,000,000 spent by the library system for new books in 1929 had been reduced, last year, to an estimated half-million. The few scientific studies of library reading that have been made would seem to suggest that Mr. Compton's opinion on the level of taste revealed would be revised if the country as a whole were considered, but most library students agree that the quality of the books taken out is relatively high, and that most of the borrowers are working people. If Mr. Compton's book is considered with other library studies, the implication is plain: the working class perhaps makes up the majority of serious American readers, even though the majority of the working class may not read seriously.

In commenting on Mr. Compton's findings, Publishers' Weekly says they seem to show "that the general level of intelligence among people without formal education is higher than people generally believe." Mr. Compton's studies, the trade journal goes on, "reveal one thing to the book trade . . . if someone ever solves the problem of how to put good new books on the market cheaply, an entirely new audience will be available." But why are attempts to reach this potential audience so persistently frustrated? Is it altogether a technical problem, as publishers generally believe? Or is it also a social problem, deeply involved with the whole question of the bourgeois domination of American cultural life?

Some of the letters Mr. Compton prints suggest a partial answer. They suggest, though dimly, that while serious cultural interests on the part of a member of the working class do not necessarily heighten his class-consciousness, they nevertheless tend to raise political issues, and lead, somewhere along their way, to his questioning the structure of the capitalist system. The letters from the readers of Shaw raise the issue of socialism, and it is noteworthy that they are much clearer and more vigorous than those dealing with the other writers. Working-class readers, it seems, are self-conscious about expressing their literary interests; in writing about Twain or Hardy they seem either afraid of being pretentious, and so say little more than that they like the books because they like them, or they accept the opportunity and phrase their responses in the most inflated textbook comment on "great" literature. But when they come to write about Shaw they are obviously sufficiently provoked and stimulated to think out their opinions and express them strongly—even where the letters are hostile they are sharply phrased, and before Mr. Compton had finished with his study of the readers of three writers he had encountered, in the quiet of the library, the pertinent question of the overthrow of capitalism. Reading the letters on Shaw after those on Twain and Hardy gives one the impression that the mere habit of intelligent reading in a member of the working class greatly increases the likelihood of his finding a clear and vigorous statement of the meaning and possibility of socialism, and that the experience has a far deeper significance for him than it has for the educated members of other classes.

It is impossible to dispute Mr. Adamic's charge that the working-class audience of proletarian novels is limited, but his assumption that the working class cannot possibly provide the basis for a highly developed culture is emphatically challenged by a study of the users of the libraries and the quality of the books they read. For his suggestion that novelists look to other classes for a vital and responsive audience, Mr. Compton suggests a possible answer. "Do you suppose that the ninety-one bosses are readers of Hardy like their ninety-one stenographers?" he asks. And he is forced to conclude that the bosses, like our Presidents since Wilson, get most of their esthetic satisfaction from detective stories and from romances with happy endings.

ROBERT CANTWELL.

Forest Hour

We said: "The sun's
gone, it is dusk, the
full moon tops
that giant spruce."

We said: "Our lips
launch clouds, the
snow's cold crunch
is brittle."

"In dusk's rinsed blue and
moon's rinsed glacial light
this forest hour," we said,
"has the vast
dream-stillness of our
shadows."

"That delicate swift
stipple of wild paws on
snow, the ferns asleep, the moss,
the sleeping birch and ash,
the sleep of chipmunks and the
starlings' sleep!" we said,
hushed as the haze of
frost.

JAMES DALY.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

A Radical-Reactionary Alliance—Making a Target of the T.V.A.—The Wizard Is Slipping—High-Class Lobbying

A MAJORITY of Congress would like to drop Mr. Roosevelt's tax program, gather up its heat-prostrated families and go home. It doesn't quite dare do it. The likelihood is that a tax measure will be passed sometime in August, and that the measure will be much more useful than the one originally proposed by the President. Instead of stopping with trivial increases on incomes of more than a million, there is hope that Congress will undertake the upward revision of the whole income-surtax schedule, perhaps beginning at the $4,000-a-year level. This is what Senator La Follette has fought for since the beginning of the depression. The left-wingers in Congress seem to have found unexpected allies among the extreme reactionaries. The latter fear currency inflation above all else, and think that if heavy taxes can be imposed at the present session, the propertied classes of the country can be mobilized a year from now to demand the end of what the reactionaries call government extravagance. By this they mean a cut in relief payments to the unemployed.

The left-wingers have exploded the silly pretense of radicalism surrounding Mr. Roosevelt's tax message. Administration supporters in Congress tried to spread the notion that, by restricting tax increases to incomes of more than a million, and estates of more than ten millions, Mr. Roosevelt was taking the side of the common citizen against the rich. Left-wingers pointed out that a family struggling along on a wretched $999,999.99 a year could hardly be counted as part of the proletariat. Since 75 percent of American families have incomes of less than $2,500 a year, even if surtax increases begin at $4,000 a year, the vast majority of citizens will still not be touched.

The defeat last week of the death-sentence clause in the utilities bill was one of the most damaging in Mr. Roosevelt's career. It is a pity that, in embarking on a finish fight with Congress, he did not pick a more substantial issue. Since the power industry is a monopoly, Mr. Roosevelt might have asked for its complete nationalization without seriously straining his capitalist beliefs. The very narrowest issue on which it would have been worth risking his prestige would have been federal regulation of the kind now exercised by the I.C.C. over the railroads. The death-sentence-clause issue was too weak to arouse mass support.

The country remembers that the elder Roosevelt, a generation ago, forced the breaking up of the oil and meat trusts, and that the severed portions thereafter continued to coöperate with great precision. Mr. Roosevelt was never in a position to say to the country: "Support me against Congress, and I will give you more plentiful, cheaper electricity." He could not promise any immediate, tangible benefits whatever. If Samuel Insull had still been frolicking in Greece, the death-sentence clause might have been made the basis for a sort of "Hang-the-Kaiser" political stunt from which Mr. Roosevelt could have personally profited.

There is some reason to believe that the primary target of the utility managements has been the T.V.A. rather than the utilities bill. Under the brilliant direction of Mr. David E. Lilienthal, the T.V.A.'s power program has become popular among Tennessee Valley inhabitants. Even reactionaries have been fired by talk of the American Ruhr, and wait impatiently for the day when the Valley will become the center of heavy industry, and land values will shoot upwards. This local enthusiasm for the T.V.A. has alarmed the utility industry. If the T.V.A. is a success, why should not government ownership and operation be adopted elsewhere in the country? According to reports, the utility managements decided that a wholesale attack upon the T.V.A. presented more difficulties than an attack upon Mr. Roosevelt's power policies in general. It is no accident that the leader of the attack upon the death-sentence clause should have been Representative George Huddleston of Alabama, whose political friends are also the friends of the Alabama Power Company. Under cover of the death-sentence-clause fight, the administration's measure containing amendments to the T.V.A. Act has been torn to bits in the House Military Affairs Committee.

It seems doubtful whether Mr. Roosevelt can regain the mastery over Congress he once had. He flung his full strength into his fight against the death-sentence clause, and was publicly beaten. His reputation as a political wizard, with mysterious powers, has vanished. Half a dozen representatives spoke against him in the House, and no thunderbolts struck them down. But the chief wound to Mr. Roosevelt's authority came, I think, from the methods he used in his fight. Persistently he forced the administration's leaders to resort to sharp parliamentary tricks. His emissaries, Thomas G. Corcoran, Charles O. West and Emil Hurja, pursued the House members without mercy. None of the administration's acts was reprehensible; certainly Mr. Corcoran's explosive ultimatum to Representative Brewster about the Passamaquoddy project was abundantly justified. But it is always imprudent for a President to use such tactics towards his own party unless he is certain he can win. The result of Mr. Roosevelt's efforts is that the feeling against him among the rank and file of the House is now extraordinarily hostile.

Congress has no more pressing duty, it seems to me, than to investigate the utility managements' lobby. Little can be expected from the inquiry begun by the House Rules Committee; the Senate should order its own inquiry without delay. The lowest estimate that I have heard of the amount spent by the utilities during the death-sentence fight is a million dollars. Other estimates run to ten times that sum. It is reported that at one time the utilities had more than a hundred lobbyists on their staff, among them four prominent ex-members of the House. Telegrams solicited, and in most cases paid for, by the utilities, showered down on the House members like a yellow blizzard. A handful of representatives, comparing notes, found that among them they had received thirty thousand telegrams in a single day. In their haste, the lobbyists sometimes made mistakes. Representative G. R. Withrow, a Wisconsin progressive, was astonished to receive within a few hours more than a hundred telegrams from Auburn, New York, fifteen hundred miles from his home district.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A new bonus army is now encamped in Washington. Up to the present time, however, the most amiable relations have been maintained with the administration. Many of the veterans have been living for the last two years in relief camps. After a few days, the relief authorities here usually succeed in shipping them back to their starting points. There are very few men, veterans or otherwise, who can resist the offer of three meals a day.

Washington. T. R. B.

Other People's Money

Two Blows for the "Revolutionists"—Some Sad Afterthoughts on the N.R.A. —The Devil Is Well Again

IT WAS a grand week for the Sound Thinkers in Washington. The House swatted the "death sentence" in the utility bill. The Senate Banking Committee—the same committee that brought in so many "reforms" two years ago—reported Senator Glass's amended Reserve bill to the Senate with some queer things in it. The tax plan troubles the Sound Thinkers, of course, but they have really derived a lot of satisfaction from it because its ill starred career thus far has revealed the President in a not very pleasant light. The general result has been dismay in the ranks of the Roosevelt "revolutionists."

The revolution, in fact, has been getting very wet. The N.R.A., apparently, has ceased to interest the President and it is being more or less abandoned to the tender mercies of the former Carnegie Steel official who succeeds the great liberal, Richberg, who in turn succeeded the great revolutionist, S. Clay Williams of the tobacco trust, who succeeded General Johnson. It is not a spectacle that any liberal can take comfort in. The pathetic ruin is hailed as the failure of liberalism. And the newspapers print with glee excerpts from the Guaranty Trust survey showing how, with the crash of the N.R.A., "planned economy" has proved a failure.

Incidentally, I listened last week to an eloquent defense of the N.R.A. and a tribute to the President from the lips of Mr. Sidney Hillman. He added a bitter attack on the Supreme Court. All this came after he had been extolled as a great labor statesman. One hesitates to criticize Mr. Hillman, who has done so much for labor, or at least for his own union. I do not criticize him, but merely comment on his views.

He was painfully disturbed at the strange bedfellows who were to be found in opposition to the N.R.A. One wonders if he could be really unaware of the strange bedfellows who were herded together in its support. Pull aside the curtains of that amazing couch and you see Mr. Hillman on one pillow and Mr. S. Clay Williams on the other. They may have differed on various points, but they were just as sure that the N.R.A. was a splendid achievement as Mr. Ogden Mills and my humble self outside were sure it was a bad thing. And when the Blue Eagle was beheaded by the Supreme Court, what an assortment of persons went storming to Washington to demand its resurrection—the gentlemen of the Steel Institute and the gentlemen of the A.F. of L., Mr. Hillman and Mr. Van Horn of the Silk Code Authority.

And as for the Supreme Court, that body was not created in 1935. The Constitution was not adopted by the G.O.P. in May of this year. Both these ancient institutions, good or bad, were in existence in 1933 when the N.R.A. was adopted. The men who framed N.R.A. knew this. To get around these two existing menaces they labeled the N.R.A. an "emergency" artifice. And even with that they feared to go into court. When they went to court they headed into absolutely inevitable decisions on two points. One was that the power of the federal government does not extend into purely intrastate matters and the other that Congress has no power to delegate in general, undefined terms its legislative powers. Both points have been settled over and over again. Statesmen—labor statesmen—in 1933 would have had this in mind. They would not have built a system upon a foundation that they knew must be necessarily swept away as soon as the Supreme Court went to work on it.

And as for this beautiful confidence in the President—only a few hours before Mr. Hillman spoke, I listened to another speech by Mr. John Frey of the A.F. of L. He told of the tobacco industry. And he quoted these extraordinary figures. The 400,000 tobacco growers in 1932 had received *gross* for their entire crop $107,000,000. But the big four tobacco companies made, not *gross*, but *net* $104,000,000 in profit on that same crop in 1932. And they paid out to their workers something less than $69,000,000 in wages. It was the representative of this industry who came to Washington to fight the N.R.A. and was made its head by that same President who inspires such confidence in Mr. Hillman. As long as labor relies on such officials its fate must remain unchanged.

It does not occur to these N.R.A. apologists that the critics they so bitterly assail have turned out to be right. In 1933 those critics said the N.R.A. was unconstitutional and would surely be junked; that it was launched to head off the Black thirty-hour bill; that it was nothing but the old Chamber of Commerce self-rule-in-industry scheme; that Section 7a was meaningless and would turn out to be so; that the whole thing would fall into the hands of the employers and that when it failed, as it would, it would discredit the whole liberal cause because it had been sold as a liberal device and that it would have set back the cause of a real New Deal because it distracted attention from real liberal measures.

Now all these things have come to pass. The start must be made all over again. And it must be made, not with the country flat on its back, the bankers discredited and the magnates penitent and ashamed, but with these tory gentlemen revived. The President has fed them several hundred millions a month and they are beginning to feel a little prosperous on government doles. He has had them to the White House for tea and has appointed them to important public posts to plan our future and they are feeling respectable again. The Devil when he was sick would have been willing to kneel and pray for banking laws and utility laws. Or at least he would have kept quiet. Now the Devil has been fed by the President and thinks he is well and so he doesn't want to stay in the monastery any more but he wants to break out and run around with the girls again.

JOHN T. FLYNN.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the Labor Front

A Joker in the Labor-Disputes Act?—Victory for the Pullman Porters—Our Unemployed Youth

WITH THE exception of one amendment, the Wagner labor-disputes bill, as finally enacted by Congress, does not differ much from the measure in its original form. But that amendment may be a joker and turn the entire Act into a company-union charter. It has to do with Section 9b, which governs the choice of the appropriate unit for collective bargaining. As first written, this provision gave the labor board the power to decide whether the appropriate unit "shall be the employer unit, craft unit, plant unit or other unit." As the section now reads, however, the choice is limited to "employer unit, plant unit or any subdivision thereof." Obviously, the ambiguity in the clause, as it stands, might permit an anti-union board to interpret it against craft unions, against locals affiliated with A.F. of L. internationals, or against industrial unions that have as members employees of more than one employer. It might even be interpreted to limit collective bargaining to company unions.

Of course, if one agrees with the policy of having the government supervise labor relations, there can be no objection to having a board decide the appropriate unit for collective bargaining. For representatives cannot be elected unless the unit is first determined. The employees themselves cannot determine the unit, because the unit must be determined before it can be known what employees are eligible to participate in the election. Yet this is an important power to place in the hands of a governmental agency that may be dominated by reactionary business interests. It may be a step toward the fascist control of labor organization, and it is the chief reason why left-wing labor leaders, especially the Communists, oppose the entire philosophy behind the Wagner measure. At the very least, if the board is to serve labor, it should not be restricted in its decisions. It should have a broad power of choice, as provided in the Railway Labor Act, which declares that the Railway Labor Board (in the conduct of any election for the choice of union representatives) "shall designate who may participate in the election and establish the rules to govern the election."

There is a strong probability, to be sure, that the shortcomings of this Act may never be of more than academic significance. For even if the new board is wholly impeccable from the labor point of view, the employers have already given notice that they will not obey the law. The Act gives them the right to appeal any order of the board to the courts and, by doing so, they can probably tie the hands of the board for the next year or two, when the Supreme Court may declare the law unconstitutional.

By a vote of 5,931 to 1,422 the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, an A.F. of L. affiliate, has won the right to represent the Pullman maids and porters in collective bargaining. The victory is significant not only because it marks the culmination of a ten-year fight by the Brotherhood against the company-union policy of the Pullman Company, but also because it is the first time that a national trade union of Negroes has been able to establish itself over the determined opposition of a large corporation. The Brotherhood, moreover, had to overcome extraordinary handicaps. Its membership was scattered throughout the country, its organizers were intimidated and frequently beaten up, its resources were practically nil (union officials have received no salaries in six years or more), and several hundred porters and maids lost their jobs during the struggle. Yet in the recent election, which was held in twenty-nine cities under the supervision of the National Mediation Board, the Brotherhood defeated the company union in every city and also won a majority of the ballots cast by mail.

Whether or not the National Youth Administration recently set up by President Roosevelt is able to give work and vocational guidance to the unemployed youth of the land, it at least directs attention to a serious problem. The Department of Labor estimates—and the estimate is considered conservative—that there are 3,000,000 young people who are wholly unemployed. In July, 1934, it found that more than a third—2,450,000—of employable high-school and college graduates between the ages of eighteen and twenty-nine were out of work. The younger element, those between eighteen and twenty-four, were hit the hardest. Within this group 44 percent of the high-school graduates and 35 percent of the college graduates were out of work.

A large number of these, of course, have never had the opportunity to work. An extensive survey made in Allegheny County (which includes the city of Pittsburgh) revealed that in December of last year about 38,000 persons, or more than a fifth of the unemployed, were seeking their first full-time jobs. In Milwaukee, 75 percent of the boys and girls graduated from nine public high schools in June, 1933, and seeking work were found unemployed six months later. For the youth, the tragic part of all this is not merely that the best years of their lives are being wasted but that they are not even being trained or fitted for work of any kind. Apprentice training and vocational guidance will be better than idleness, but unless the government can also find real jobs the National Youth Administration will not help greatly in solving the fundamental problem.

The high-handed policy of President Tighe of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers to maintain control by expelling the militant rank-and-file unions received a setback last week, when Federal Judge Nelson McVicar ruled that the Riverside Lodge in Cleveland had been expelled illegally and was entitled to reinstatement. This opens the way for the reinstatement of some thirty other steel locals which were expelled under similar circumstances. And since these locals, if reinstated, will have a large majority of the membership of the Amalgamated, they should be able to carry through their own aggressive campaign of organization in the industry. This looks like bad news for Mr. Tighe and the steel employers.

The popular notion that railroad workers are among the aristocrats of American labor receives rather harsh treatment in a report recently issued by Coördinator Joseph B. Eastman. From an analysis of actual payroll records, covering approximately 300,000 railway em-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ployees, it develops that nearly 20 percent received less than $600 in 1933, 50 percent less than $1,200, while only 20 percent received more than $1,800—the minimum amount fixed by authorities. The study, one of the most thorough ever made of any industry, shows that nearly a million employees lost their jobs between 1921 and 1933, approximately 600,000 having been displaced since 1929. Thus the drop of 24 percent in yearly income between 1929 and 1933 represents only part of the drastic effect of the depression on the railroad workers. At present basic rates of pay are below the minimum standards in other industries. "For the railroads to continue to pay these low wages," the study concludes, "will certainly not be in the public interest—underpaid and exploited workers are poor producers, poor consumers and poor contributors to the well-being of their communities."

WILLIAM P. MANGOLD.

A Note on Abstract Painting

ONE OF the points brought out by the exhibition of "Abstract Painting in America" held at the Whitney Museum last spring was the fact that between 1915 and 1935 a surprising number of American painters had turned to Europe for direction. A few of them came to understand the trends that painting was taking with their European contemporaries during that time quite thoroughly—in fact, were able to produce work along the same lines that might have passed without adverse comment in any group showing of *avant-garde* European work of its period. Save for a "Flower Forms" piece by Charles Sheeler from 1919, an oil entitled "City Walls" by Niles Spencer dated 1921, and a water color, "Provincetown, 1918," by Charles Demuth, the work of this handful constituted the only exhibits of any interest in the Whitney show. Yet it was also clear from the showing that this efflorescence had been more in the nature of an exercise in appreciation than one of personalized creative expression; that no native "abstract" art had developed from it; and that there was no promise of such an art's developing from it in the immediate future.

From the paintings themselves the explanation for this failure was not readily apparent. Many of the canvases, in spite of their obvious debt to a foreign tradition, showed a genuine sensibility and a mature technical grasp. Since these American artists had been in touch with the work of the leading abstract painters in Europe, traces of a European approach in their work were hardly unnatural. Nevertheless, the nationalist critics employed it as an excuse to bring forth the usual complaints against alien influence of any sort. And of course the advocates of nationalism and anecdotalism had another text to illustrate their belief that abstract art must always be sterile.

But all these questions become clearer when we consider them in a historical light. The "abstract" movement in France, which would later inspire the American abstract painters, was originally associated with the interest in primitive art, especially Negro art. Yet this did not result in sterility. Picasso's painting of his 1907 "Negro period" was in some respects a pastiche and parody of Negro sculpture, and yet it developed clearly and logically into his later work, in which all superficial traces of the 1907 contact have disappeared. Perhaps this offers a hint of what is wrong with the American approach to abstract painting.

The fact that a foreign tradition is involved clearly does not affect the issue: European art in "going to school" to Africa and the South Seas was certainly making a wider pilgrimage than American art in turning to Europe. The difference in results evidently had its roots in certain differences of attitude on the part of the artists themselves. For the European painters of the early nineteen hundreds, after their first Romantic encounter with primitive art, took up an approach to it on purely analytical grounds. They pulled it to pieces to discover its inherent principles, then built their own expressions on these principles, not on physical resemblances. Primitive art may or may not have profoundly influenced European painting. But in either case, as soon as the leaders of the new movement (already started on its journey toward cubism) had familiarized themselves with primitive art sufficiently to understand the principles underlying its effects, the temptation to copy surface features disappeared. The younger men had set themselves certain plastic problems to solve—problems in representing forms as apprehended conceptually, rather than visually. They went to primitive art because they felt primitive art contained solutions of somewhat similar problems. Their interest was not in adopting, or reproducing, the idiom of African or South Sea sculpture, but in the plastic fundamentals of the art. And out of the principles they saw illustrated there, a new style of their own grew up, stage by stage, with no grafted elements, organically—a style that was, in its essence, merely the outward form of their solutions of problems peculiar to a certain time and a certain environment.

On the other hand, it was evident in the Whitney show that when these same formal solutions, constituting what might be termed "abstract painting in Europe," were approached by American painters, they were almost universally adopted, so to speak, full-grown. Unlike the attitude in Paris about 1907, there was little evidence of an attempt here to reduce such stylistic solutions as Cubism, Futurism or Superrealism to the problems that underlay them—at least not any evidence of subsequent applications of their underlying principles along new lines. And because of this failure to carry analyses any deeper than the physical organization of the elements of expression—or perhaps better, because of the failure to relate these elements of expression to something more immediate than the problem that called the European solutions into being—the adoption of these means of expression seems never to surpass the level of a rearrangement of the same—or similar—elements into a varied but similar organization. In the less intelligent borrowings one frequently finds an admixture of plastically unrelated features, or of attitudes that basically conflict. But even in the most conscientious interpretations—such as those by Max Weber of Futurism and of Picasso's earlier work, Gorky's interpretations of the later Picasso, or Schary's Superrealist Alice-in-Wonderland illustrations—even in these there is no evidence of the artist's advance beyond the point to which his original problem carried him. They remain sensitive appreciations—paraphrases, as it were—lacking the force and immediacy of a direct personal expression.

JAMES JOHNSON SWEENEY.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

An Omen for America

SIR: In the name of a group of Cuban revolutionary exiles I would like to call your attention to the following considerations:

Cuba's situation is not today being given the same consideration it has received in analogous circumstances in the past. We believe that "what was crime under Hoover's is also crime under Roosevelt's administration" and we think that those who in the past stirred up such an outburst of generous and unanimous protest among the liberal and democratic elements in the United States should do the same now, even if only to check the insistence of the press on calling "public enemies" and "bandits" those whom they regarded before as "victims" and "heroes."

We strongly reject the hypothesis that this attitude of American public opinion is the reflection of a change of mind concerning Cuban affairs, because of boredom or disappointment. We know very well it is the result of ever growing international complications and internal problems in the United States. And, for this reason, it is our duty to insist on the importance of Cuba's problems.

The true dramatic value of a play is never judged by the size of the stage, but by the play's intensity. This is the case with Cuba. American capital is invested in Cuba to a greater extent than it is in any other country in the Western Hemisphere except Canada. That is why the problems of such a small country have always had big repercussions in the United States. That is also why its problems have to be considered internal problems of the United States, problems whose neglect can bring about grave consequences. It should not be forgotten that Cuba is an experimental field for oppressive forces that are gaining strength day by day, and it is no exaggeration to say that the same exploitation, crime and tyranny now existing in Cuba will gain headway in the United States if the people who are menaced by them weaken their position by not fighting them in Cuba.

New York City. P. DE LA TORRIENTE-BRAU.

A Jane Addams Memorial

SIR: The death of Jane Addams places a responsibility upon those who have appreciated her work in various fields to see that it is continued and increased. Especially is this true in the case of Hull-House, which among her many interests was closest to her heart. The value of Hull-House in American life, as a pioneer among social settlements and an example of the way in which association among members of different groups and races can be made serviceable to all, is unquestioned. To thousands of individuals of the neighborhood, through the schools of music, painting, ceramics, drama and dancing, as well as classes in more formal education, through social clubs, the gymnasium, the summer outings, Hull-House has been a source of immediate relief from depressing conditions and of encouragement and aid in fulfilling aspirations for the future. To thousands of residents, for longer or shorter periods, Miss Addams' home has been an initiation into sympathetic and helpful relations with the less privileged. Moreover, Hull-House has been a social laboratory where experiments of benefit to the whole country have been conducted. Hull-House was a pioneer in juvenile research, from which came the Juvenile Court, in the establishment of playgrounds, in the protection of aliens.

To continue the House in its spirit of present usefulness and future progress, the Trustees, upon the advice of many friends, have established the Jane Addams Memorial Fund. During her life, Miss Addams obtained from friends or gave from her own resources about $30,000 a year, one-third of the annual budget of the House. It is hoped that a sum can be raised, the income of which will replace Miss Addams' financial contribution to the work she founded and loved. The Jane Addams Memorial Fund is an opportunity for all who loved her to show their appreciation of what she meant to her city, her country and the world. Subscriptions may be made to Louise De Koven Bowen, Treasurer, 800 South Halsted Street, Chicago.

Chicago, Ill. ROBERT MORSS LOVETT.

Turner and the Frontier

SIR: To one who knew Frederick Jackson Turner, Louis Hacker's review of "The United States, 1830-1850" [The New Republic, June 5] seems rather harsh, but it must be admitted that the Turner analysis no longer suffices. Yet whatever his shortcomings, it is inconceivable that his interpretation of American history as a process of expansion should ever be outmoded.

The chief omission of Turner's writings is his failure to analyze adequately the forces behind that expansion. . . . From the beginnings of colonization until the closing of the public domain the frontier has been the advance guard of expanding capitalism. On the frontier have operated all the factors of an older society tending toward stratification and inequality. Chief of such factors is capital. The land speculator, the money lender, the promoter and investor, the merchant, manufacturer and carrier—all these were the mainsprings behind the settlers. By providing capital they financed settlement and entrenched themselves in the position of economic mastery. . . .

Turner's work now needs to be supplemented by a study of the part of capital in frontier expansion. Who put up the money to finance settlement? . . . Why did the markets for farm produce and raw materials so often fail to keep pace with the growth of production? How long did it take for enterprises in new communities to fall into a relatively few hands, thus providing surplus capital to finance the resettlement of the dispossessed?

These are questions that the Turner hypothesis raises but does not answer. Above all is the question of paramount interest: did the frontier, by providing successive opportunities for investment of surplus funds and the employment of surplus laborers, make the capitalistic system work? If so, what of the frontierless present?

Madison, Wis. CURTIS NETTELS.

A Plea for Ethiopia

SIR: A cry—"Help or we perish"—comes ringing across the waters from the oldest Christian nation in the world, Ethiopia. The hand of the despoiler is at her throat. She looks to the United States, peopled by lovers of peace, believers in justice, as the only genuine, disinterested friend she has in all the world.

There is time to halt the ravishment of this little nation that has asked only to be let alone to work out its own destiny ever since St. Mark entered Ethiopia thirty years after the Crucifixion and founded the Abyssinian Coptic Church, oldest of Christian denominations.

The Committee for Ethiopia has been organized to answer Ethiopia's cry for help and has established headquarters at 228 East Forty-fifth Street, New York City. It proposes to:

1. Unite and crystallize public sentiment against war waged by a powerful nation upon a non-aggressive and peaceful people; to circulate petitions asking the League of Nations to act upon the pleas now being made by Ethiopia, a member of the League.

2. Ask the clergy of all faiths to set a nationwide day of prayer and protest against this threatened rape of Ethiopia.

3. Disseminate the facts about conditions and events within Ethiopia to the press, magazines and other vehicles of public opinion in the United States.

4. Prevent Communist elements from taking advantage of the Italo-Ethiopian crisis to further their present subversive propaganda and agitation among Americans of African descent.

5. Organize and equip a modern, mobile hospital and ambulance unit to be sent to Ethiopia; to assemble and ship medical and other non-military supplies.

6. Erect in Addis Ababa, capital of Ethopia, a modern short-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wave wireless station for contact with the outside world in case present communications are cut off by hostilities.

7. Be active specifically for peace in this direct instance, since American peace societies are prevented from so being because of their constitutions and programs.

ROBERT E. S. HARRIS,
New York City. Secretary, Committee for Ethiopia.

Understatement

SIR: When the bonds of the industries in the United States were worth a few cents on the dollar, Bruce Bliven of The New Republic suggested that we buy the United States. Land values were reduced to where farms were selling at the cost of improvements when Secretary Wallace proposed that we bond ourselves for a few billion dollars and buy the land. These suggestions look like the wisdom of a Solomon when compared with the New Deal inanities.

Bentonsport, Ia. MATTIE HOWARD.

Trade-Union History on the Radio

SIR: The story of the founding and growth of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union has been dramatized for radio and is now being presented over station WEVD, New York City, each Wednesday evening at ten o'clock, Eastern daylight-saving time. The dramatizations were written by Florence Lasser, and are enacted by the Radio Drama Group of the League for Industrial Democracy and members of the I.L.G.W.U., some of whom repeat their roles from life. The story is told in a series of six weekly programs, starting July 10, and electrical transcriptions are being made so that they may be reproduced in every center where members of the I.L.G.W.U. are numerous enough to interest the local stations. This is the first time the history of a union has ever been dramatized for radio, and it is hoped that the series may inspire members of the I.L.G.W.U. and of other unions to hold what they have won and continue the advance of the working class.

New York City. MARK STARR.

A Request for Mozart Letters

SIR: I am preparing a complete edition in English of the Mozart family correspondence, based on that of Professor Ludwig Schiedermair, published in 1914 by George Muller, Leipzig. I should be grateful if any of your readers who are in possession of unpublished letters of Mozart or his family would kindly place them at my disposal. They will be copied and returned at once and treated with the greatest care while in my possession. My address is 38 Arkwright Road, London N. W. 3, England.

London, England. EMILY ANDERSON.

Extracts from Letters

PAUL CONLEY FRENCH, president of the Newspaper Guild of Philadelphia and Camden, sends us a description of the group plan for medical care which the Guild has worked out in conjunction with the C. Dudley Saul Medical Clinic. The Guild members pay a small monthly service fee and in return get a complete medical service including physician's care, hospitalization, all surgeon's and hospital fees, medicine, nursing and all expenses for any illness or injury whatsoever, up to a maximum of three months in any one year. The service also includes greatly reduced rates for families and dependents. This is regarded as a significant effort in bringing complete medical service within the financial range of a white-collar group.

The Prisoners' Relief Department of the International Labor Defense is making an appeal for a summer milk fund for the children of political prisoners. They write: "Two hundred and fifty children will not only go without summer vacations, play, recreation, camping, but will be denied one of the vital necessities of childhood—milk—unless we can succeed in enlisting widespread support in their behalf." The League asks that contributions be sent to Rose Baron, secretary of the Prisoners' Relief Department of the International Labor Defense, 80 East Eleventh Street, New York City.

Miss Frances Stern, of the Boston Dispensary, writes to compliment our article on "Extravagant Relief" by Berl ben Meyr [The New Republic, May 22]. Miss Stern stresses the importance of an adequate diet, regardless of economic level, and points out that although an official government publication says "restricted diet allows little margin for safety and cannot be recommended over an indefinite period," the new schedule for relief wages apparently takes no cognizance of that statement.

The National Student Federation of America, founded in 1925 to promote student welfare and academic freedom, sends us a preliminary report on plans for an amalgamation of that organization with the International Student Service. Under the plan, the N.S.F.A. offers its organization and facilities to the I.S.S. and in turn would become the American section of the international body. The amalgamation plan arises from the growing pressure upon student groups all over the world and the resultant need for student solidarity, and is made "contingent upon the continuation of the present policy of the N.S.F.A. of defending the rights of students and professors to study and discuss freely all aspects of all questions."

The United Coöperative Conference of New York and the United Consumers of Philadelphia send notice of a two-weeks Workers' Institute to be held at La Citadelle Farm, Doylestown, Pennsylvania, from July 15 to 29. The Institute will study the history of the coöperative movement and workers' problems in present-day life and will augment its study courses with group recreation in singing, dancing and dramatics.

The Unemployment Councils of Greater New York send notice of a demonstration and march on City Hall which they plan for July 13. Their chief demands are for trade-union wages on all relief projects, an immediate 25-percent increase in relief, the right to organize, elimination of discrimination, an allowance for clothing, and an allowance of sixty cents per week per family for ice during the summer.

The National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners announces a $50 prize for the best one-act play on Angelo Herndon, whose sentence of eighteen to twenty years on the Georgia chain gang was recently stayed by Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts. The plays are to deal with the internationally famous incident of Herndon leading a protest demonstration of Negro and white workers for increased relief funds. The contest opened July 1 and closes October 1. The winning play will be published in New Theatre magazine and performed by New Theatre groups. The judges will be Angelo Herndon; Elmer Carter, editor of Opportunity Magazine; John Wexley, author of "They Shall Not Die"; Philip Barber of the New Theatre League; and Alfred Hirsch. Material on the case of Angelo Herndon, as well as the rules of the contest, may be obtained from Alfred Hirsch, secretary of the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Dr. Caroline F. Ware, formerly associate professor of History at Vassar College, sends us copies of correspondence between herself and the University of Wyoming, which engaged Dr. Ware to teach history at its summer session this year and then canceled the contract when it discovered that she is married. Dr. Ware protests against the University's rule prohibiting the employment of married women as being a blow at the integrity of American education and the status of American women.

Miss Louise Davies, a librarian of Ventura, California, writes to question the accuracy of Newton Arvin's judgment, based on the circulation figures of public libraries, that Mark Twain is the most popular American author, living or dead [The New Republic, June 12]. Miss Davies thinks Twain's high showing in library statistics is due to the fact that public libraries are fully stocked with his works, and says that if sufficient copies were available, such authors as Kathleen Norris and Zane Grey might easily outstrip him in total number of borrowings.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

Mr. Justice Cardozo: A Man of Good Will

OUT OF the recent planetary turmoil of the Supreme Court, those down below who have been counting on the liberal Justices have been denied even a handful of stardust. Mr. Justice Roberts cut short in the railroad pension case what had been all along a rather indecent one-sided flirtation. Justices Hughes and Stone have been giving the liberals a passing solace, but theirs was never a deeply rooted point of view, and their liberalism has waned with the decline of the prestige of the New Deal. As for Mr. Justice Brandeis, it is unfair to regard him as "a lost leader": it has been evident for several years that he does not relish his traditional role as the Lucifer of the rebellious angels, especially when the cause to be fought for is as inglorious as the Roosevelt policies, with their overgrown administrative structure; his final defection, while it has spread dismay among many, should not have occasioned surprise.

The last white hope was Cardozo, too freshly come to the Court to have turned into a tired liberal. His dissenting opinions in the Liggett chain-store case and the Panama hot-oil case had shown that he took seriously the Holmes tradition of free interpretation. Finally, in the N.R.A. and farm-mortgage cases, he went over to the unanimous Court. But even as he faltered in the Schechter case, he preferred to write a separate concurring opinion, less dour and mechanical than the opinion of the Court. He was throwing a last regretful glance at the road not taken. He muffed a great chance for creative judicial statesmanship. But more than any other justice he has emerged from the fiery ordeal, as he emerges from the pages of Mr. Pollard's book,[1] a man of good will.

Mr. Justice Cardozo's career, like that of Mr. Justice Brandeis, is one of the sheerest records of achievement in our history. Each step in it was cleanly won: from the bar to the State Supreme Court in 1914; after a few weeks, somersaulting the Appellate Division and, by the extraordinary request of a united Court, landing in the New York Court of Appeals; Chief Judge in 1926; the national bench in 1932. But unlike his colleague, who had carved out a public career as a fighting People's Attorney before he came to the bench, Mr. Justice Cardozo's entire life has been cloistered.

It is one of the ironies of legal philosophy that this pragmatic theorist of the law, who has written in praise of "life" and "experience," should have lived his sixty-five years so completely removed from both, making the life of the mind the source as well as the focus of everything. None the less I wish the author had given us not only a "liberal mind in action" but a liberal mind in the making. Here is a bookish man: what were the books he learned from, and in what order? What influences in the climate of opinion shaped his thinking—social and philosophical as well as legal? What were the turning points in the growth of his mind? Instead of answering such questions, Mr. Pollard organizes his book around a topical grouping of Cardozo's cases (personal injury, crime, constitutional problems, etc.) and gives a lucid account of each. I should have preferred the other book, which has still to be written, but this one was worth doing and has been done with clarity.

If it suffers from anything, it is chiefly a strain of over-reverence and a persistent Mazdaism. One gets a feeling that in Mr. Justice Cardozo, American jurisprudence has finally fulfilled its destiny. And one gets also a feeling that American life has been the struggle of the forces of light (liberalism) against the forces of darkness (conservatism), and that whenever the liberals have won a decision it has been a good thing, and when they have lost it has been a dark day. But I can understand how easy it is to feel reverence for Mr. Justice Cardozo. With his selflessness, his asceticism, his austerity, he is a cross between a Gandhi and a Cato. He has an amazing combination of immense technical ability, philosophic breadth and distinction of style that has made him the delight of law teachers and the evening solace of lawyers who care about their craft. In fact, so great was his ability that he seemed doomed never to get to the Supreme Court. He was, moreover, a New Yorker, and with Hughes and Stone already on the Bench, that was an added disadvantage. When in 1932, President Hoover under intense pressure from Borah, Wagner and others, reluctantly chose him to succeed Holmes, the choice seemed too good to be true. Professor Chaffee expressed a widespread opinion when he said that Hoover's choice had "ignored geography and made history." And Dean Pound, writing a foreword to this book, places Mr. Justice Cardozo (in a list that strangely omits Mr. Justice Brandeis) among the ten greatest judges in American history.

But, Pantheon aside, what is Mr. Justice Cardozo's orientation toward his task and what is his place in the historic process? To say that he is a liberal is to say something that is being increasingly stripped of whatever meaning it may once have had. While writings on the Supreme Court tend to the Gilbert and Sullivan view that every Justice is either a little Liberal or else a little Conservative, it is well to remember that Supreme Court liberalism is not all cut of one cloth. Mr. Justice Holmes was a philosophic liberal: in the midst of social tensions he could carry on the judicial process as if from Olympus. He had a sense that civilization survives all fighting faiths, and that none of them needs to be constitutionally suppressed; and accordingly he did not have to bother too much about economic theory or circumstance. Mr. Justice Brandeis is an economic liberal. His greatness has lain in the very fact that he *has* made a fighting faith of liberalism. But his economic theory, realistic as it is in its details, belongs in its preconceptions to an earlier stage of capitalism. It is a kind of economic primitivism, based on the idea of restraining business within small units and competitive limits. He is continually saying Hello to reform. And as the gap widens between his theory and the rigor of the machine process, it is safe to predict that he will fall back increasingly on his moral fervor and, while retaining his tremendous personal influence on his colleagues, will cease to be a vigorous creative figure in American law.

Can Mr. Justice Cardozo create a third type of liberal-

[1] Mr. Justice Cardozo: a Liberal Mind in Action, by Joseph P. Pollard. New York: The Yorktown Press. 327 pages. $3.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ism? The record of his achievement on the New York Court of Appeals, as Mr. Pollard gives it, is impressive in its humanity and its fine grasp of legal realities; from his vantage ground on the most important state court, his influence on the doctrine of the other state courts has undoubtedly been immense. But nothing in his opinions reveals a clear economic orientation. His perspective is rather that of a finely tempered juristic philosopher who takes a broad view of the judicial process. He has a mind that combines to a hitherto unparalleled degree the generous and the scrupulous. He can balance the claims of social change against the desirabilities of social stability, the logical against the sociological, the merits of free interpretation against the rigors of constitutionalism. His is probably the most truly judicial mind on the Bench today. But by that very fact he seems disqualified from assuming the vigorous leadership that John Marshall had in his time, and Holmes and Brandeis have also had. For, like so-called objectivity in the academic sphere, a nice judicial balance may lead ultimately only to social quietism.

As chief judge of the New York Court of Appeals, Cardozo's qualities fitted him admirably for leadership; he was so clearly beyond partisanship that every word of his carried weight; and he was dealing primarily with civil cases, where there is much to be said for the slow geological process of "the growth of the law." But in dealing with constitutional law on a national scale, in a period of national crisis, a scrupulous judicial temper is not equivalent to a broad conception of statesmanship. Intelligent as he is, Mr. Justice Cardozo has missed the lesson of history everywhere: that the movement of economic forces will not wait for, or yield to, an overnice balancing of legalistic phrases.

It is the cruel irony of judicial liberalism that, despite the greatness of some of the work of Holmes and Brandeis, it should prove inadequate to deal with the problem of an expanding national power in the period of crisis. Mr. Justice Cardozo came to the Court heir to Holmes's tradition of fine tolerance and Brandeis' method of judging every case in the context of the social conditions that gave rise to it. He had the chance to inaugurate a new phase of the history of liberalism by applying his fine gifts to the task of the Court in what is probably its most crucial period since John Marshall. From following the stands that Mr. Justice Cardozo has taken in his three years on the Court, it seemed reasonable to believe that he could distinguish between the powers that will eventually have to be granted the national government through the commerce clause, and the arbitrary powers to be denied to the President as an undue delegation of legislative power by Congress.

Through this distinction a liberal jurisprudence could have proceeded on safe ground, and Mr. Justice Cardozo's dissent in the Panama case held out hope that he would apply it. But his Schechter opinion, while intelligible on the score of delegated powers, turns its back (through an unnecessarily narrow interpretation of the commerce clause) upon everything that a long tradition of liberal constitutional interpretation had gained for itself. It is Mr. Justice Cardozo's weakness that his economic realism and his grasp of the movement of social forces are not on a par with his judicial temper. He may in future cases take a more vigorous stand and seek at least to lead a Court minority back to a broad interpretation of national power. Otherwise he will be trying to meet the conditions of capitalist crisis with no better equipment than that of a man of good will.

MAX LERNER.

Blessed Are the Peacemakers

Europe: War or Peace? by Walter Duranty. Boston: World Peace Foundation. 47 pages. 50 cents.

The Pipe Dream of Peace, by John W. Wheeler-Bennett. New York: William Morrow and Company. 318 pages. $3.

Peace and the Plain Man, by Norman Angell. New York: Harper and Brothers. 344 pages. $2.50.

The Price of Peace, by Frank H. Simonds. New York: Harper and Brothers. 380 pages. $3.

THE TITLE of Mr. Duranty's booklet, "Europe: War or Peace?" is a question that is asked today more anxiously than it was in 1914. But the question is asked not only for Europe: with infinitely less background of historical friction, wars have been going on or threatening in South America and in the Pacific. The problem of peace in the present world, which has become more and more an indivisible unity, cannot be understood so long as our eyes are almost hypnotically fixed on Europe and the peace treaty of Versailles.

Europe is not only an armed camp "at present"; it has been an armed camp, at least since the treaty of 1871. The rivalry between France and Germany, which Duranty regards as a chief factor in modern Europe, is equaled if not surpassed by the many-centuries-old German-Slav hostility. The peace treaties of the suburbs of Paris in 1919 were only one stage in the development of ancient controversies. Nations trained to regard force and the soldier not as temporary evils but as the lifeblood of history, tempt others to the conclusion: "It is logical to suppose that certainty of opposition by a greatly superior force is the sole argument which they will find convincing." During recent months, even a public inclined toward optimism and easy solutions in discussing war and peace seems to realize that the problem is everywhere on earth the same: the problem of emotional and economic nationalism. The public is also beginning to realize that no solution can be reached by damning or revising this or that treaty; as a matter of fact, the peace treaty of Versailles has been in many points revised and its harshness mitigated almost since its signature. The only hope lies in going to the fundamentals of the universal situation and getting ready to pay the price that all nations without exception will have to pay if they sincerely believe in peace and coöperation as more essential than their own sovereignty or the standard of power and life they enjoy by virtue of temporary advantages.

The discussion of peace has become in the last months, for Europe and for the Pacific, tinged with more pessimism, but also with greater realism and maturity. John W. Wheeler-Bennett, a well known British student of international affairs since the World War, has presented in "The Pipe Dream of Peace" the story of the collapse of disarmament. The disarmament conference, well prepared over a period of twelve years by the memoranda and expert opinions of generals, admirals and diplomats, broke down because each nation considered every proposal in the light of its own special interests and wished to shift the burden of disarmament upon other more "aggressive" nations. Thus, the United States and Great Britain urged the prohibition of submarines, but clung to their battleships, whereas smaller Powers exactly reversed the stipulation.

Mr. Wheeler-Bennett successfully links the story of the disarmament conference with the inner development of Germany. He calls Chancellor Brüning's dismissal by President von Hindenburg (whose reëlection in the previous month Brüning more than any other man had brought

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about) a tragedy—"No European statesman of modern times has been so basely betrayed and ungratefully treated." But the triumph of the new Chancellor, von Papen, was the prelude to Hitler and to the final collapse of the moribund disarmament conference. Mr. Wheeler-Bennett's book is a very interesting account of history during the eventful years from the beginning of 1932 to the end of August, 1934, when it became clear that it was not the nebulous movement of "regeneration" but the old Prussian military caste that had gained complete control of Germany.

Norman Angell is an old-time pacifist, but of all his books on peace I liked his last the best. "Peace and the Plain Man" will be a healthy corrective to the confused thinking of all those who clamor for a league to enforce peace but dislike sanctions and infringements upon sovereignty; in a clear, persuasive style, it exposes other fallacies that prevail among pacifists. Many of them see in capitalism the reason for war, and in the bankers and industrialists, the men who profit by death. But the difficulty of the whole problem consists in the fact that wars are made by the people themselves, who insist upon policies of national sovereignty and protection of national rights, and impose those policies upon their governments. There is, however, a weak point in Mr. Angell's argument—namely, that he regards "the people" and "the nation" and "the plain man" as abstract and indivisible entities. He does not take into consideration the conflicts of interest that divide a nation into many sorts of "plain men," some driving toward war and others dumbly driven.

It is often asserted that alliances and precommitments make for war. Mr. Angell points out that freedom from commitment did not keep the United States out of war; on the contrary, "commitment would have kept them out, since if Germany had known that by following a certain line twenty-two states would range themselves against her, she would not have followed that line and there would have been no war." Mr. Angell's discussion of the economic and psychological factors is as illuminating as it is useful. He suggests that security can be obtained by means of collective guarantees that the status quo shall not be changed by war. That is certainly better than the system of individual defenses without precommitment, and it may represent the best that practical politics can do today. But it will not be sufficient to prevent wars that are rooted in our whole social structure. An economic organization of the world as a whole may seem utopian, but it is no more utopian than the abolition of war. The plain man may not like it, but he has to face the fact that an international federation is the price we have to pay for peace if we really want peace.

Mr. Frank Simonds in his last book, "The Price of Peace," faces the issue frankly. He sees the war danger as arising not out of peace treaties but out of the more elementary fact that the Japanese, Italian and German peoples find themselves restricted by their own economic poverty in raw materials and land resources, and by the monopolistic policies of more fortunate nations—especially the United States and Great Britain. "The price of peace is the assurance of economic security to the peoples of all of the Great Powers. Patently this price of peace must be paid by those nations, of which the United States is the most striking example, whose material resources bestow the largest measure of economic self-sufficiency."

In this respect Mr. Simonds is certainly right, but he overstresses the matter of disparities in the material resources of the Great Powers, and leaves out of consideration the far less favored countries, India and China. These may offer no imminent war dangers today, but they will not consent to remain forever at a standard of life far below that of Germany, Italy or even Japan. The nations that are not (or are not yet) Great Powers also demand consideration of their claims to justice. Mr. Simonds concentrates upon economic nationalism and its challenge, but the claim for justice made by the German people, for instance, is not only economic. And the difficulty arises of determining just what justice is. With some nations (Germany, Japan, Fascist Italy seem to belong to them), justice is a dynamic notion that from achievement to achievement grows in its claims and aspirations. To some, justice seems to imply not equality of all the nations, but superiority. Therefore, the price to be paid for peace seems to be not merely concessions to the less favored strong nations, but "some form of international agreement which will assure" equality of opportunity and standard of life to all.

Mr. Simonds makes clear how heavy is the price of peace:

> It is unmistakable that a country as richly endowed materially as is the United States can, at least temporarily, achieve domestic prosperity by means of purely monopolistic economic policies. But it should be equally evident that a people which permits its government to pursue such policies deliberately bolts and bars the door to world peace. And that people, so far from expecting others to disarm in the face of such a course, must turn its attention to the multiplication of its own means of defense against the attacks that course renders inevitable.

HANS KOHN.

Under the Round Table

Tortilla Flat, by John Steinbeck. New York: Covici, Friede. $2.50.

NOT SINCE the days of W. W. Jacobs, making his charming characters out of scoundrels, has there been a book quite like this one. Both Jacobs and Steinbeck must have worked on the assumption that most of us, having a slice or two of Caspar Milquetoast in our systems or a streak that calls for out and out anarchy, are likely to revel in the antics of anyone getting away with what he shouldn't. The *Paisanos* of Tortilla Flat get away with a great deal in their tireless efforts to supply their gullets with red wine. They are a mixture of Spanish, Indian, Mexican and assorted Caucasian bloods. A sunny-eyed, unmoral lot, with invisible means of support, their paganism is chiefly expressed in their disreputable ways and means of acquiring wine.

The incidents that make up the book are based on this driving force and revolve around Danny and friends, who live in Danny's house, drinking enough wine to tell their stories, chase their women, and beat the daylights out of each other when the spirit moves them. Despite their free and easy lives these knights from under the round table have a sense of philanthropy and will steal any day to help a friend in need. Mr. Steinbeck knows the humorous side of his *Paisanos,* and if he has emphasized their eccentricities to the point of burlesquing them, he can be excused on the grounds that he rarely fails to be amusing. When he isn't amusing it is either because he is trying too hard to eulogize a philosophy of life that is as dust-laden as your copy of the "Rubaiyat," or because he lets his nature worship display itself too much. Mr. Steinbeck's pantheism, much more prominent in his other books than in this one, often confuses the effect of his otherwise fine narrative manner.

JERRE MANGIONE.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Granddaddy of the G-Men

Vidocq: The Personal Memoirs of the First Great Detective, edited and translated by Edwin Gile Rich. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 445 pages. $3.

THIS CONDENSED version of the famous detective's memoirs starts off very well as an amusing picaresque story. Soon, however, it becomes the somber and rather dreary tale of Vidocq's escapes while he was one of the hunted, and of his captures when he turned hunter himself. Apparently Vidocq cared more for the truthfulness of his story than for any possible adornments. But notwithstanding their inferior literary worth, these memoirs have a special interest for students of literature: they are the original source of much criminal and detective fiction. Victor Hugo's Jean Valjean is obviously modeled on Vidocq, whose efforts to free himself from the clutches of the law and lead an honest life were again and again frustrated until he offered his services to the police. Balzac's Vautrin also contains elements derived from Vidocq, though his fierce, concentrated energy is peculiar to his creator. Poe, Gaboriau, Dickens and Conan Doyle are all said to have drawn upon the memoirs.

Some of Vidocq's remarks are quite surprising for a police agent; but then we must recall that he turned police agent out of necessity, not from choice. "Prisons are schools" he observes at one point—schools in which criminals perfect their art and from which they emerge more dangerous to the society that has bred, trained and tortured them. In the light of this statement, it is all the more remarkable that, after he had resigned from the police, he opened a paper mill in which all the employees were ex-convicts who had found it impossible to earn an honest living because of the prejudice against them. The venture, so creditable to Vidocq's heart, failed. He also observes on one occasion that though "the thieves and robbers were frightened for a brief moment by several arrests I made one after another, they were not slow to reappear in greater numbers, and perhaps more audacious than ever."

He does not clearly express it, but in this sentence he stumbles upon the profound truth that society produces crime and criminals just as it produces wheat and iron, trade and wars. That it also produces them in definite amounts, in accordance with the price of bread and other like indexes, was established, at about the time of the appearance of the memoirs, by Quetelet, in his day recognized as the foremost statistician in Europe. In our day and country no one, perhaps, has more clearly appreciated the fact that crime is a function of the social order than Clarence Darrow, who in an address to the inmates of the Cook County jail told them that their being behind the bars, instead of walking free outside, was a matter of pure accident. But of course it is no accident that those behind the bars come in preponderant numbers from among the poor, just as it is no accident that the rate of mortality among the poor is higher than among the well-to-do. It was reserved for Lombroso and his school to discover a criminal type with distinct physical traits—as though there were no criminals among the rich, and as though crime were an immutable fact of nature and not a social concept that changes with the changes in society.

But of course, observations of a criminological order are not what has attracted so many writers of crime and detective stories to the memoirs; they are interested mostly by the special qualities of Vidocq's mind. There is nothing of the grandiose in his career, as there was, for example, in that of the notorious Aseff. The crimes with which Vidocq was charged, and for which he suffered grievously in many vile prisons, were of the petty sort; and when he turned police agent, he was set to watch over ordinary crooks, thieves and murderers. It is not so much what he does that is engrossing; it is rather the ingenuity and tireless will that was behind all his adventures—and these are the very stuff out of which criminal and detective fiction is made.

HERMAN SIMPSON.

On the Bum

Somebody in Boots, by Nelson Algren. New York: The Vanguard Press. $2.50.

Hungry Men, by Edward Anderson. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. $2.

BOTH OF these books are built around a subject that, once unknown to most of us, is quickly becoming almost as standard in background and situation as the older and more romantic themes of adventure: the life of men who live on the road, on the bum. Their vocabulary is familiar—sallies, sinkers, misery and punks, shacks and floozies, vag charges, de-lousers, reefers, redballs—but still strange; their various bits of action are predictable, but exciting at the same time. This because they are parts of a violent hard life and because the choice of such a subject for writing seems to demand a certain method of the writing itself: that it be done at close range, not only in the jargon but in the pitiless objective mood of the thing, with a great deal of fidelity to detail.

But vivid action against a natural, though little known, environment will not serve all the purposes of a novel. Nelson Algren writes most of his book with such a rash will to literary power that heads are rolling, sores running, eyes hanging by a slimy thread and intestines dragging all over the place, this whole effect being extended even into the duller pages by an indiscriminate rough-housing of images ("her nose sniffing elegantly, as though to spew green phlegm sunward"). Besides, his hero is too weak, inept and sheerly dumb to live, and in the rare intervals when he is not being kicked in the groin by enemies of the working class, it is arranged that he shall step on a loose board and, plop, kick himself. During most of the book he seems more a slug than a man, arousing no feeling of kinship or respect or affection—only pity. And pity of this sort is pretty thin slops to float a novel on.

Fortunately, by the end of the book Cass McKay is allowed to have a square meal and a friend, and to make something tangible out of himself. And other matters have been similarly cleaned up, including the author's prose, which is both lush and inept for chapters: "He felt the heart within him pumping, pumping momently." "Somebody in Boots" deals with matters that can't help being interesting for themselves when authentic; but it would make a fair book only if its author had thrown it out and used what he has apparently learned to write another.

As its title claims, Edward Anderson's book is about hungry men, but it is a rather polite book and they are not very hungry. A young man bums into New York and gets friendly with some of the seamen sleeping around Battery Park. A whole country full of men sleeping in parks—he thinks it rotten that something should not be done about this. But no violence; he can't agree with Boats (Boats comes through pretty solidly as a character, "short, and built like a fireplug"), who says communism might do it. After a brief job on an excursion steamer he becomes more

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disgusted, starts working with Boats in agitational work that ends in a demonstration before the Seamen's Institute: if the fat directors are a charitable institution, where is their charity? The directors are found to be elsewhere, the police not. The police find it necessary to kill someone. It is Boats, of course. The hero slips town, and ends up finally in Chicago, playing in a street band and ironically beating a rap by denouncing the International.

This is a well done, if episodic book, with a firm quiet realism and no particular destination. (There is a good sense of developing social consciousness in it, but that part of it is curiously unfinished, as though having served briefly as an excuse for the story and for timeliness, and the end is even suspicious.) It is the Doubleday-Doran prize book (sharing honors) and looks it—by which I mean simply that it will not shake anybody to his foundations or wound any feelings. It is not false, it is fairly new. It makes good reading. OTIS FERGUSON.

Books in Brief

There Is No Truce: A Life of Thomas Mott Osborne, by Rudolph W. Chamberlain. New York: The Macmillan Company. 420 pages. $3.50.

OSBORNE seemed to have been born under fortunate stars. To the inheritance of family, culture and wealth he added personal attractions and accomplishments and power over men. And yet the stars turned malign. "Few men," says his biographer, "have ever been so unerring in their choice of the losing side." Mr. Chamberlain brings out the secret of his constant defeat. He was Don Quixote with a streak of the playboy. The zest with which he assumed disguise made it difficult for his contemporaries to take him seriously. When he began his crusade for prison reform by incarcerating himself in Auburn Prison, it seemed only the old exhibitionism; but if ever a man went down into hell to free the souls in pain there, it was Osborne. He was framed on the charge of homosexuality by the devils who would not have their rule disputed; and to that charge the playboy behavior gave some color. Though he was properly acquitted he saw his work in ruins. Mr. Chamberlain has written a clear account of a baffling personality. It may be hoped that his book will serve to extend the revival of interest that he sees in the cause to which Tom Osborne gave more than his life. R. M. L.

The Role of Money: What It Should Be, Contrasted with What It Has Become, by Frederick Soddy. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 224 pages. $2.

Once more Frederick Soddy returns to his favorite subject: the decisive part played by money in our very sick world. Where he is describing the mechanics of money and exchange, the "mysteries" of credit and debt and the vast economic confusions to which the abuse of these things gives rise, Professor Soddy is a very useful guide. And his concept of "virtual" (that is to say, definite physical) wealth does help to clarify many of the confusions imposed upon us by the equivocal operations of finance-capital. As usual, however, difficulties at once begin to bristle when the unquestionably vital problem of subordinating money to the needs of a genuinely socialized production is regarded *purely* as one of monetary reform. Professor Soddy, for all his earnestness and great technical ability, cannot or will not realize that money is an instrument for the maintenance

THE VIKING PRESS N. Y.

"Most Powerful..."

The author of *Tobacco Road* and *God's Little Acre* confirms his brilliant position in American letters with these seventeen new stories. His most mature work to date, this volume is being enthusiastically welcomed by an ever-increasing audience. It is Erskine Caldwell's fastest-selling book, and, according to Harold Strauss in the *N. Y. Times*, it is "... Erskine Caldwell's most powerful work...." $2.50

KNEEL TO THE RISING SUN

by Erskine Caldwell

•

Dream—and Reality

Shvambrania was discovered in their own imaginations by two Russian boys, brothers, who took refuge in it from the drab reality of the everyday world. In Shvambrania, wars were glorious and bloodless adventures, justice always triumphed. Then came the Revolution of 1917 and a new, exciting world called to them. These naive memoirs reflect clearly the impact on growing minds of the most significant social change of our time. $2.00

The Land of SHVAMBRANIA

by Leo Kassil

Distinguished Teller—Distinguished Tales...

Arnold Zweig, creator of *The Case of Sergeant Grischa*, has long been known in Europe, not only as a superb novelist, but also as a master of the short story. These tales of simple men and women, the anonymous populace, although wrought with a light and delicate touch are significant comments on contemporary European life. $2.50

PLAYTHINGS OF TIME

by Arnold Zweig

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of a highly specialized and anti-social control over the means of production. Change the *nature* of that control, or ownership, and monetary reform has at least a practical chance of success. H. W.

Magnificent Hadrian, by Sulamith Ish-Kishor. Introduction by Theodore Dreiser. New York: Minton, Balch and Company. 214 pages. $3.

The story of Hadrian, the Roman Emperor from 117-38 A.D. and of the boy Antinous who died so mysteriously, has troubled historians, for the story has a unique quality among the scandals of the Roman Empire. The survival of Antinous as a miracle-working deity plagued the Christian fathers into invective, while the face and figure of the boy seem to have given classic sculpture its last impulse. This author intends to rescue the man and boy from both mystery and invective and to restore Hadrian to the role of a good emperor. She stretches the incidents of the love tragedy on the rack of psychoanalysis, but she manages to wring out some truth by the process. There are neglected elements, of course, such as the oriental invasions of the Roman temperament; there are, too, conjectures and assumptions. But the upshot of this attempt to tell, in a tragic vein, of these remote individuals, is moderately worth while. K. W.

The Other World, by Madelon Lulofs. Translated by G. J. Renier and Irene Clephane. New York: The Viking Press. $2.50.

Pieter Vos, an eternally frustrated underdog, emigrates from Holland to the Dutch East Indies to try and make a man of himself. Among the natives of Deli, the rubber country, his ego gradually asserts itself, though the whites *(blandahs)* there continue to treat him as an inferior. His one friend and colleague, philosophic old Blom, leaves him all too soon. Pieter finds a modicum of happiness with his native housekeeper, until an unscrupulous speculator offers him promotion to a plantation on a lonely island, palming off on the poor dupe one outworn Dutch sweetheart and some worthless rubber shares. The depression finds Pieter and his wife in Holland on leave. After a terrible scene, in which she ruthlessly exposes the situation, Pieter runs away to die on his island, attended by his loyal housekeeper and their half-caste son. A moving story, competently translated, of a misfit at odds with the world, against a tropical background authenticated by the author's fifteen years in the Indies. B. F.

Contributors

H. N. Brailsford is the London correspondent of The New Republic. His books include "Rebel India" and "Property or Peace."

Robert Cantwell is the author of two novels, "Laugh and Lie Down" and "The Land of Plenty."

James Daly has had both poetry and prose published in magazines, and has worked in steel mills, taught school, directed and acted in the theatre and written advertising copy.

James Johnson Sweeney is the author of "Plastic Redirections in Twentieth Century Painting." He has contributed to art magazines and general publications.

Max Lerner has recently been appointed lecturer in Government at Harvard University. He has contributed articles on the social aspects of law to legal periodicals and is now at work on a forthcoming book, "The Supreme Court and American Capitalism."

Hans Kohn is professor of History at Smith College. Among his books are "A History of Nationalism in the East," "Nationalism in the Soviet Union" and "Orient and Occident."

Jerre Mangione is a member of the staff of a publishing company and has written for The London Spectator, The Literary Digest and The New York Sun.

Herman Simpson was formerly an editor of The New York Call, the Socialist daily which was discontinued several years ago.

The initials signed to the brief reviews are those of Robert Morss Lovett, Harold Ward, Kenneth White and Berthold Fles.

GREEN MANSIONS
KEYNOTE TO A
PLEASANT VACATION
At a Most Modern and Complete Adult Camp
INTIMATE ● COLORFUL ● ALIVE ● PRIVATE GOLF COURSE
Booklet on Request
For Information:
GREEN MANSIONS
Warrensburg N. Y.
City Office:
157 WEST 57th STREET
COlumbus 5-6346
Lena BARISH Sam GARLEN
Directors

A Delightful Hide-Away
in the mountains inviting people of better taste. Wholesome food, delightful companionship, outdoor sports. Open all year.
Chesters' Zunbarg
Woodbourne, N. Y. Tel: Fallsburg 2F 22

TIMBERLAND
A Modern Camp For Adults
●
Booklet on Request
83 W. 42nd St.
PEnn. 6-7663
The Rare Charm Of An Intimate Congenial Group
Rate: $29.50 a week
Superior Cuisine
De Luxe Accommodations
Fare: $5.00 by Packards
TIMBERLAND In the Adirondacks
Pottersville, N. Y., Warren County
Esther R. Kessler — Israel H. Kessler

THE SUPER SPORT FIELD
will keep you busy in
CAMP NITGEDAIGET
ON THE HUDSON — BEACON, N. Y.
AD BATES Instructor in Dancing
LITTLE THEATRE presents Weekly Plays
CONCERT PROGRAMMES by Pierre De Geyter Trio
FIVE-PIECE ORCHESTRA for DANCING
Special—Chorus—Sport—Cultural Directors
$14.00 per week — $2.65 a day
Hotel — Bungalow Accommodations
Transportation by: Cars—Boat—Train
Call Beacon 731 — City Office, EStabrook 8-1400.

GENERAL

DARWIN WAS RIGHT! But some people are mentally superior despite ancestry. 3c stamps brings plan connecting intelligent people. Unusual books loaned free. **Contacts, Box 91, Station D, N. Y. C.**

CAMP
TAMIMENT
THE PLAYGROUND FOR ADULTS IN THE POCONOS
NIGHTS of sparkling entertainment, talking pictures, musical and dramatic programs directed by Mac Liebman.
SPORTS—Seventeen fast tennis courts, handball, 100 boats and canoes, swimming in private lake, saddle horses.
Daily Lectures by Authorities.
$29.00 weekly, de luxe cabins at small extra charge.
Streamlined bus service direct to Camp. Air-Conditioned cars on Lackawanna R.R.
TAMIMENT
TAMIMENT, PENNSYLVANIA
New York Office: 7 East 15th Street
ALgonquin 4-6875 Booklet on Request
Philadelphia Office: Rittenhouse 3394

CAMP UNITY
Wingdale, N. Y. Ideal for progressive workers, socially-minded professionals. On lake Ellis in Berkshire foothills. All land, water sports. Theatricals, lectures, concerts, dances, etc. Finest food. Cars leave daily. $16 week; $2.75 day. Folder. 50 E. 13th St., N. Y. C. ALgonquin 4-4611.

FOR SALE OR RENT

IN CORNISH, N. H. Old Cape Cod cottage. Fireplaces, wood lot, eight acres good land. Annetta J. St.-Gaudens, Windsor, Vermont.

For other summer places, see Page 11

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED